Orders p 131

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. X SUMMER, 1958 No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

A Conception of Catholic Ecumenism

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

Personalities of the Council of Florence, II
Cardinal Bessarion

JEROME CORNELIS, A. A.

Catholic and Protestant Relations in Germany

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An Allocution of Pope Pius XII on Eastern Monasticism. A Recent Survey of Religious Tolerance in the Irish Republic — Efforts for Jewish-Christian Understanding at Freiburg-im-Breisgau and Its Ecumenical Significance

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S. J., Professor of Patristic Theology, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome, and Rector of the College of St. Robert Bellarmine.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association*, and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor:

Rev. Fr. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary;

Rev. Fr. GERMANUS TOMAINO, S.A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for Italy - 900 Lire (Seminarians 700 Lire)
Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, New York, U.S.A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscriptions $ 2.00
Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre
140, Strand
London. W.C. 2, England

Single Copy — 4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription — 15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. X SUMMER, 1958 No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.
A Conception of Catholic Ecumenism

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.
Personalities of the Council of Florence, II
Cardinal Bessarion

JEROME CORNELIS, A. A.
Catholic and Protestant Relations in Germany

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
An Allocution of Pope Pius XII on Eastern Monasticism. A Recent Survey of Religious Tolerance in the Irish Republic — Efforts for Jewish-Christian Understanding at Freiburg-im-Breisgau and Its Ecumenical Significance

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

† Aloysius Traglia
Archiep. Caesarien., Vicesgerens

Rome, August 14, 1958

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

A CONCEPTION OF CATHOLIC ECUMENISM

The word 'ecumenism' has little by little taken on a new significance in this century. In 1900 an international missionary conference meeting in New York was designated as being 'ecumenical': its Protestant organizers intended to signify by that term their resolution to bring the Gospel to all the inhabited world (οἰκουμένη). A similar congress, but of much greater importance, took place at Edinburgh in 1910. It was there that the late Charles Brent, then Episcopalian bishop of the Philippines, spoke of a new ideal. It was all well and good, he said, to bring together different separated communities in order to co-operate in the mission field; but why not go beyond the divisions themselves and bring into realization the unity of the Church? A climate was thus created in which the word 'ecumenism' again came to connote an intention, a new intention — that of reuniting within the compass of one and the same Church the different Christian bodies. It is quite remarkable that at the time Bishop Brent assigned no other term to the movement he was launching than that of unity. It was no longer a question of collaboration, of the federation of different members; it was necessary, rather, to work for the realization of one sole communion in one sole Church. One Church, visibly one as Christ wished it to be: such was the vision — as he termed it — that came to Charles Brent during the Edinburgh Conference. « During these past days a new vision has been unfolded to us. But whenever God gives a vision, He also points to some new responsibility, and you and I when we leave this assembly, will go away with some fresh duties to perform » (1).

But alas! it was soon evident that the ideal thus envisioned was a distant goal. The conference planned consequent to the Edinburgh meeting appeared possible only if its objectives were modest: to get to know one another better; to intensify the desire for unity; to see better, in particular, the issues on which Christians differed, and thus to prepare the way for action on the part of each community in favor of reunion.

---

(1) *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, by Ruth Rouse and Stephen C. Neil, London, 1954, p. 407.

At the first World Conference on Faith and Order held in Lausanne in 1927, the report dealing with unity insisted upon practical collaboration rather than on the unity of faith. It is true that this was accepted only with reservations and sent back to the Continuation Committee. Actually, however, the Conference was little more than a renewal of ' fellowship ' which scarcely contributed anything to the problem of unity. In any case, the Continuation Committee, in sending reports of the Conference to the churches, did speak of the movement towards Christian unity (2).

The second World Conference held in Washington in 1937 drew up a message in which is found this remarkable statement: « We are divided in the outward forms of our life in Christ, because we understand differently His will for His Church » (3). And further on: « We humbly acknowledge that our divisions are contrary to the will of Christ ... ». Here is to be found the whole interior drama of ecumenism: on the one hand, there is the will to be with Christ; and on the other, Christians are divided against His will. What, then, must be done to bring division to an end? The answer, simply, is to let there be agreement concerning the will of Christ with regard to His Church. Should not, in fact, one conclude: Let us, therefore, find out what Christ willed His Church to be?

There are at least three occasions in which the World Council made the Church the object of its discussions. This was first of all the case at Amsterdam at the time of the First Assembly. But there it was less a question of defining the Church than of examining and describing the various conceptions the member-churches had of it. These divergences were reduced to a duality of tendencies: one was termed ' Catholic ' in order to signify the need of apostolic succession, and the other ' Protestant ', according to which faith alone is necessary.

The Amsterdam Assembly had chosen a Central Committee which was to meet each year. In 1950 this Committee held its sessions at Toronto and approved a document entitled « The Church, the Churches, and the World Council of Churches ». In order to know the ideas of the World Council leaders regarding the Church, this statement is particularly recommended. It presupposes a serious study of ecclesiology, and consequently it is well adapted to the field of action of a Council established to promote unity. It could very well serve as a topic of discussion; but such as it is, it actually represents little other than a practical code for

---

(2) Ibid. p. 425.
(3) Ibid., p. 434.

relations between member-churches; or, at the most, it remains but a working hypothesis with a view to further research. (The text of this declaration may be found in the *Ecumenical Review*, vol. III (1950), pp. 47-53).

It is primarily to the Commission on Faith and Order that the study of ecclesiology has been referred. In the Conference which this Commission held at Lund in 1952, one of main tasks was to deal expressly with the notion of the Church. There again, it was above all a question of bringing to the fore agreements and disagreements on this theme. In any case, the introduction published just previous to the Conference represented a remarkable effort of getting to the bottom of the matter; one could detect in it possibilities of a rather well defined theology, and there was no despairing of eventually arriving at a synthetic doctrine of the Church which would eliminate the principal divergences (4). If one day a result of this kind were to be attained, the doctrines of the present day could not be left in their state of manifest diversity. Thus, the preparatory document for Lund supposed a definite progress in the awareness of what the true Church of Christ should be. Its framers were on the right road.

At Evanston, where the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches took place in 1954, there was little emphasis on doctrine. It may be that the delegates to the Assembly were more acutely aware of their divisions. At all events, the section on Faith and Order issued a report on unity in which a certain conception of the Church is presupposed. The Orthodox delegation, however, declared unequivocally that it could not accept that concept. In effect, the authors of the report had once more attempted to affirm the existence of unity amid the present diversity rather than to eliminate that diversity. It was a good thing that an authentic unity, without ambiguity, was demanded in the name of the Gospel, and for this the Orthodox were deserving of credit. Nevertheless, one can hardly say that the solution of the problem of the Church made any real progress at Evanston.

A certain idea of the nature of the Church is evidently implied in the documents of the World Council. But it appears that this idea is not considered as unchangeable since one may reject it and still belong to the Council. After the conclusions arrived at in Toronto, in fact, a church may be accepted as a member even if it should consider itself as being the one true Church of Christ (5).

---

(4) *The Church in the Purpose of God*, by Oliver S. Tomkins, in *Faith and Order*, no. 3, p. 37.

(5) Cf. Ecumenical Review, vol. III (1950) p. 51.

Such would be the case of the Catholic Church if it were part of the World Council. Such actually is the case with the separated Eastern Churches which have chosen to belong to it. The presence of such a Church means that the other member-churches do not regard its position as impossible and that therefore the idea of the Church in the Council is indeterminate enough not to exclude it. Thus, one must not always take the literal sense of the word 'Church' as found in the Council documents which often neglect the hypothesis of a unity already visibly realized according to the will of Christ and the fact that it should be a question not of constituting that unity but of participating in it.

* * *

The World Council being what it is, what should be the attitude towards it on the part of a Catholic theologian who has dedicated himself to promoting the unity of Christians? He should first of all give complete acceptance to the fact that the Roman Catholic Church is not a member of the Council. Following the declaration of Pope Benedict XV in 1919, she gives as her reason the opposition existing between her own doctrine on the unity of the Church and that which is presupposed by those belonging to the World Council. She is the Church of Jesus Christ — she and she alone. If the Council does not deny this, it at least doubts it; while the Church can neither doubt it nor even appear to doubt it.

Let us in this instance recall the words addressed by Pope Pius XII to a group of German Catholics from Mainz in 1948. « If the Church », he said, « is inflexible before all that could have even the appearance of compromise, or of an adjustment of the Catholic Faith with other confessions, or of its confusion with those differing from her, it is because she is convinced that there has always been and always will be one sure citadel alone where there have been safeguarded in a completely infallible manner all the truths and all the fullness of grace given to us by Christ: and that this citadel, according to the explicit will of her Divine Founder, is none other than the Church herself » ([6]).

In conferences and discussions with Christians separated from Rome, one will, on occasion, have to declare unequivocally in what manner Catholic principles oblige him to conceive the reunion of Christians, that is to say, by the entrance of non-Catholics into the fold of the Church of Rome. This in fact is the mind of the Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement published by the Holy Office in 1949, a document which contained this memorable remark:

([6]) A.A.S., 1948, p. 419.

« These things should be declared clearly and openly, both because non-Catholics themselves are seeking the truth, and because apart from the truth genuine union will never be able to be realized » (7).

In any case, the aim which the World Council ought to pursue, that of Christian unity, is also ardently wished for and actively sought by the Catholic Church. Nothing stands in the way of — actually everything counsels — contacts between Catholic theologians and responsible leaders of the World Council. It is simply a question of good will and of interest for a common cause. The co-operation of Catholics, offered from the outside and in proportion as it is acceptable, will bring about a more exact knowledge of those points of Catholic doctrine which prejudices and misunderstanding have obscured or deformed in the minds of our separated brethren. In this way, too, useful studies could be organized on those very questions which are of interest to one or the other section of the Genevan Council. This would bring the Catholic viewpoint to bear on the declarations, messages, and initiatives of the World Council. One can legitimately believe that an institution created for the unity of Christians would like to know how its action is judged by one half, if not more, of those who bear the name of Christian.

It cannot be too often repeated that the World Council is the offspring of the Ecumenical Movement, but it does not follow that it absorbs all of that movement. For outside of its organization a considerable amount of good work is being done for the cause of Christian unity, not only among Catholics but also among other confessions, Lutheran, Calvinist, and Anglican. If the Catholic theologian follows attentively the workings of the imposing organization created at Amsterdam, he will also be careful to keep himself free for his own proper activity, so as to participate in other independent and progressive efforts which have appeared on many sides. We are thinking, for instance, of Dr. Asmussen's group in Germany, of the Community of Taizé in France, of a certain number of Anglo-Catholics, etc.

Whether he carries on his own personal work or whether he collaborates in a common task, the Catholic ecumenist — by that I mean the Catholic who dedicates himself to the cause of Christian unity — should, it would seem, keep in mind three separate phases affecting the problem of reunion. These one might designate as being: the proper ecumenical atmosphere, the possibility of modifications, and the necessity of intransigence.

---

(7) « ... deque unica vera unione per reditum dissidentium ad unam veram Christi Ecclesiam », *A. A. S.*, 1955, p. 144.

We can resume in a word all that the milieu for ecumenical activity calls for: it is charity — a fraternal charity, patient, disinterested, one that can regard itself in the mirror of the thirteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. As for being penetrated with it, we have more than the general reasons which oblige a Christian to love all men. Here we have ties with baptized persons who love and adore the same God as we and the same Christ, who have not chosen their state of separation, but who have accepted it as an inheritance considered sacred, and who in good faith and according to a long tradition regard Catholicism altogether differently from what it actually is. Even if they should detest us, they would still be our brothers. « Wayward brother », St. Augustine would say to the Donatists, « quarrelsome brother, you are nevertheless my brother. Like me you say: Our Father, who art in heaven. We say the same thing: why, then, are we not together in unity? (8). But in actual fact they do not detest us. In the last half-century their attitude has undergone a change: they regret division and are seeking unity.

In an atmosphere of charity, one will make an effort to be just, avoiding the making of excuses for Catholics who have done wrong as well as exaggerating matters in which others have sinned. In what regards those elements which are justly termed non-theological factors of disunion — nationalism, sectarianism, historical antipathies — one will strive either to reduce or to neutralize them. A perfect objectivity with reference to events of the past as well as in the exposition of doctrines under discussion is always much easier and quite natural when the mind is sympathetically disposed. Even if one feels bound to express a judgment which is displeasing to his adversary, he will only do so with the intention of being helpful and in a manner which will not be offensive. By so doing, a spiritually conditioned atmosphere will be created where sincere and profitable conversations will become ever more frequent.

We come now to those factors of disunion which arise from theological positions or from respectable traditions. Here it is important to distinguish between that which is essential and that which is not. Catholicism does not import simply an adherence to certain determined doctrines. It is a way of life which expresses itself also in worship, in the liturgy, in chant, and in all kinds of other manifestations. Evidently, everything is not of the same importance in this ensemble: there is that which is of obligation and that which is free, that which is traditional and that which is new, what is popular and what is limited to a few,

---

(8) Sermo 357, no. 4, P. L. 39, 1585.

what is official and what is private — and in this connection I am not referring to exaggerations or abuses. This is tantamount to saying that all is not unchangeable. In the domain of the accidental, the Church can change, as in fact she has changed. She lets fall a certain practice, perhaps one that was useful and popular for a long time, in order to take up another which better corresponds to the needs of the times. Like humanity itself, the Church is in motion. It follows, then, that the Catholic ecumenist can address himself to his separated brethren in two different ways, according to the occasion. At one time he will say: « That which displeases you is only an accessory, it is not Catholicism; limit yourself to what is essential ». And at another he will say: « That which displeases you is not unchangeable; it could eventually disappear ».

We have in fact seen obstacles removed for the purpose of favoring adherence to the Church. For a period of time in certain countries, whoever entered the Catholic Church had to abandon his liturgical language and his rite and become a Latin. Today, and for a long time previously, the Church protects non-Latin rites. And quite recently, too, the present Pope permitted a few former Lutheran clergymen to be ordained priests, even though they were married. All this justifies us in asking those Christians who are separated from the Church of Rome to give more attention to what in the Church is essential and irreformable.

This latter, however, must be maintained clearly and unswervingly. This is necessary for the very interests of ecumenism, understood as the quest for unity. I recall having had on one occasion an audience made up almost entirely of Protestants, one of whom directed this question to me: « Is it conceivable that the Roman Church will ever go back on one of its dogmas? » I replied naturally that this was unthinkable, and my questioner thereupon concluded, logically enough, that Christian unity could be realized only on condition that every Christian accepted all the dogmas of the Catholic faith. If this point is obscured, illusions will persist; and these will give rise to a false assurance, as well as paralyzing necessary research.

Now, it sometimes happens that, despite the repeated affirmations of the teaching authority of the Church, certain non-Catholic ecumenists dream of a future in which, in consequence of gradual modifications, Catholic doctrine will be sufficiently attenuated or transformed — or, if you will, perfected — thus becoming more reconcilable with their own fundamental positions. But this can never be the case. Catholic doctrine could be better explained, better presented, be better known; but no part of it will ever be changed,

neither the supremacy and the infallibility of the successor of St. Peter, nor the defined privileges of the Mother of God, nor the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist by transubstantiation, nor any of those truths which a Catholic must believe today. If, then, non-Catholic Christians are convinced on the one hand that Jesus Christ has willed unity of faith for all His faithful, and on the other that this is impossible without the acceptance of Catholic doctrine, they will be led to a careful consideration of that doctrine; and then they will perhaps discover that it in no way destroys what seems truly Christian to them in their belief, but in fact perfects it.

When it is a question of its own nature and worth, the Catholic Church cannot consent to putting herself on the same plane with other confessions. This is a cause of astonishment to Protestants and Orthodox, and even to some Catholics. They appeal to the idea of equality and say: What the Church claims, all the churches claim. When the best runner is to be chosen, all the runners leave from the same starting point. Let the Catholic Church, then, be on a par with the others and from there show its superiority. For example, when she prays for unity, let her pray like the others, ready to accept a unity other than the one that she believes to possess, or at least to forget that she possesses it. This is their mode of argument.

Yet one must guard against an over-simple equalitarianism. In fact, not only is the Catholic Church not on an equal level with other confessions, but she cannot even suppose herself to be, nor pray as if she were. She is bound to give witness of herself. She cannot perform any act nor utter any prayer by which she would appear not to be what she is. She cannot ask for herself that which she already possesses by the will of Christ: this would be a disavowal of what she has. She beseeches God to defend her and to make her grow in unity; but she does not pray to be given unity since she knows that she has received this as one of the gifts of her espousal with the Son of God. To none of her members is it permitted to act in any other way. I can, indeed, pray as do Protestants, asking like them, both for myself and for them, the grace of sanctification; but I cannot, like them, ask for the unity of the Church. And this is so because I have to understand that unity which my Church would communicate to them; while they cannot have such an intention — at least in an explicit maner.

When Abbé Couturier proposed that prayer for the sanctification of Christians be offered during the January Octave of prayer for unity, he singled out a good intention for a common prayer. But he did not wish in any way to modify the Catholic conception of unity, and non-catholics should not think that this conception

has been changed. When a Catholic prays for the unity of the Church, he prays that our separated brethren accept the doctrine, the worship, and the government of the Roman Catholic Church.

Perhaps at this point, it can be seen to what limits the effort of the Catholic ecumenist must extend itself. He is always careful to bring about that atmosphere of prayer and of charity which is the condition of every fruitful action. In the realm of ideas as well as in the field of activity, he distinguishes and causes to be distinguished the accidental from the essential. Above all he aims at the progress of doctrinal agreement. This cannot be merely utopian, because Christian unity depends on that agreement and also because Our Lord wills that unity. On the same occasion that I referred to above, one of my Protestant listeners made two observations which it seems to me summarizes what can be said in support of a solid hope. His first remark went something like this: « Since Christ wills unity, and He is the master of history, why should we ever despair of attaining it? » He also chided those who with too hasty an assurance oppose the authority of the Bible to that of the Church: « It is not as easy as many think to always know the real sense of the Bible ». For the attainment of unity, therefore, we must have confidence both in the power of Christ and in the help the Bible can afford us.

Without doctrinal agreement, not only is reunion impossible, but the effects of disunity are inevitable. Because they disagree with us regarding the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Protestants by their negations provoke Catholics, and incidents like those in Spain and Colombia come about. Because of their denial of papal supremacy, Protestants in the United States and in Canada refuse to have their governments follow the example of some forty other countries who are officially represented at the Holy See. It is because of doctrinal disagreement, too, that Catholics and Protestants often find themselves in opposite camps during parliamentary elections. Other examples of this kind could be cited as well. In any case, it is clear that only where there is one doctrine can there be but one religion.

If it is to attain its goal, then, the Ecumenical Movement must concern itself primarily with doctrine. The Catholic ecumenist will accordingly be called upon to give an exposition of his own faith. In doing this, he will have to think through the faith of others in order to determine the exact point where error began and to seek out the reasons for its diffusion. But above all he must present the contested truths in a well-adapted manner, in all clarity, and in the most cogent way possible. Far from creating an opposition

between ecumenism and apologetics, he will be at once both an apologist and an ecumenist.

In this way the Ecumenical Movement will be able to move forward. If it should fail to advance beyond the institutions that it has brought into being, it would fall far short of its goal. In such a case, it might simply have ended up by creating an anti-Roman bloc and rendered division even deeper. If it were to limit itself to organizing friendly meetings and courteous addresses, it would gradually fade away into lassitude and indifference. On the contrary, the movement will become all the more intensifield if ecumenists of all confessions take full cognizance of the evils of separation and, determined to bring them to an end,, consecrate themselves to restoring unanimity in the truth.

Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J.

PERSONALITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

II. Cardinal Bessarion

Though Cardinal Bessarion has many claims to fame, — as a humanist, a diplomat, a reformer of monasteries — he is best known as the apostle of union between the Latin and the Greek Churches, and it is rather under this last aspect that we shall consider him here.

He was a native of Trebizond, born on 2 January 1402, at a period, that is, when the last Greek possessions were being threatened on all sides by the victorious arms of the Turks. What had once been a great empire, embracing all the eastern Mediterranean, was by this time sadly reduced. Africa, Syria and Palestine had been lost early, and then Turkish forces absorbed Asia Minor, crossed the Dardanelles, and encircled Constantinople also from the west and north. That city had been besieged for more than three years at the turn of the century and was relieved in 1402 not by the prowess of its own arms, but because the Mongolian invasion had temporarily challenged the Turkish power and defeated it. Trebizond, it is true, was then an independent Greek kingdom, but it would not long survive the eclipse of Constantinople and lived equally under an ever present threat of destruction.

Of Bessarion's early life little is known in detail. While still quite young he was taken by the Archbishop of Trebizond to Constantinople where he was educated under the care of the Metropolitan of Selymbria in one of the schools of rhetoric that flourished there. He took the monastic habit on 30 January 1423 with the name Bessarion, by which he has always since been known. Thereafter he began to make a reputation for himself as an orator, and in 1426 was in his native Trebizond on a diplomatic mission, perhaps concerned with the imperial marriage of John VIII to Maria Comnenos, daughter of the Emperor of Trebizond. He was ordained priest in 1431 and shortly after went to the Peloponnesus whose Despot received him graciously. At Mistra he studied under George Gemistus, the great exponent of Platonic philosophy, as a result of which Bessarion too became an ardent Platonist and a great admirer and friend of Gemistus. In 1436 his mediation in composing one of the many quarrels between the Emperor John

and his brother, the Despot Theodore, drew the attention of the authorities of Constantinople to his talents, with the consequence that he was soon called to that city and made head of the monastery of St. Basil. Shortly afterwards he was elected to the See of Nicaea, at about the same time that Mark Eugenicus became Metropolitan of Ephesus, Isidore Metropolitan of Kiev and All Russia, and Dionysius Metropolitan of Sardes. The elevation of all these was not unconnected with the negotiations for a council of union between East and West, then reaching their climax, for they were outstanding among the Greek clergy for their philosophical and theological ability, whereas the general level of learning of the oriental hierarchy was not very high.

After the Greek arrival in Ferrara in the beginning of February 1438 and the solemn opening of the Council of union on 9 April, there was a lull in the proceedings till Latin insistence on action of some kind produced a reluctant acquiescence from the Greeks to consider such a possibility. In the preliminary meetings that followed between committees of ten members from either side, Bessarion was one of the Greek delegates. When Mark of Ephesus' reply to the opening speech of Cardinal Cesarini was censured by his colleagues as too rough and discourteous for such an occasion, Bessarion was put up to speak the next time so that his urbanity and polish might make up for the bad first impression. The result of those meetings was the decision to discuss the question of Purgatory, still between the two committees. On the Greek side the Emperor appointed Mark Eugenicus (of Ephesus) and Bessarion as sole spokesmen. The Latins opened the discussion on 4 June asserting that there is such a state as Purgatory and that in it there is purification by fire. Subsequent debate was largely centred on the second assertion, Bessarion speaking on 14 June to prove that Greek theological tradition did not accept it. The discussions on Purgatory continued for some weeks and then petered out, without any agreement having been reached, probably because by then everyone's attention was focused on the plague that had infested Ferrara.

The Greek ecclesiastics remained in the plague-stricken city all that summer, though without casualties. Fear of the pestilence, financial difficulties (for the Pope was already in arrears with his payments for their maintenance), prolonged absence from home — these and other like factors reduced the Orientals to great distress and made them anxious now to get on with the dogmatic conversations and to get away. The date for the discussions was fixed. Six orators on each side were to act as speakers for the rest. The Greeks elected among their six Bessarion, Mark

Eugenicus and Isidore. The choice of the exact subject of debate was left to the Greeks who, at the instigation of Eugenicus and George Gemistus, decided to impugn the legitimacy of the addition by the Latins of the *Filioque* ('and from the Son') to the Creed, whereas Bessarion and a few others would have preferred to start on the orthodoxy of the Filioque doctrine.

The honour of making the opening speech of the doctrinal sessions fell to Bessarion, a proof that he was considered by his own as their most accomplished orator. To the Fathers assembled in solemn session be extolled the greatness of the occasion, congratulating both sides on their goodwill for union and exhorting Pope, Emperor and Patriarch with all the other members of the Council to bring to a glorious conclusion what they had so happily begun. Mark Eugenicus then enunciated the Greek charge that the Latin Church was responsible for the schism by the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed in defiance of the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus against any change at any time to any part of the Creed, and added his proofs from the definitions of the Councils. Andrew, Bishop of Rhodes, answered from the Latins. Bessarion in a speech extending over the greater part of two sessions (1 and 4 November) replied to Andrew's syllogisms and reaffirmed the Greek position, that to add to or subtract from the Nicene Creed even a word or syllable was forbidden, not only to the Roman Church, but to the universal Church, and therefore much more so to the Church of Rome, because the Council of Ephesus had so enacted.

Writing later, Bessarion said that until Cardinal Cesarini began his defence of the Latin action (some two sessions later) the Greeks were having the better of the debate, but Cesarini's many and forceful arguments began to make him doubtful of the strength of the Greek position and then convinced him that the Council of Ephesus could not have tied nor have meant to tie the hands of the Church for ever. Not all the Greeks, and especially Mark of Ephesus who was the speaker of the Greeks for the rest of the time at Ferrara, were of the same opinion, and the sessions went on till mid-December, always on the same topic and showing no prospect of leading to agreement.

In January the Council was transferred to Florence. By mutual consent the subject of discussion was changed to the orthodoxy of the *Filioque* doctrine. Bessarion did not speak on this in the Council. Mark Eugenicus was the sole Greek orator. Eight sessions were held, but ended without agreement, and by that time it was already 24 March 1439 and the Greeks, by now away from home for full sixteen months, were beginning to be

desperate. They refused to entertain the idea of further public discussions, a method that had so far proved fruitless. Some other way should be found to lead to union, they said, or else they should go home.

The public sessions, however, had not been entirely without result. The able arguments and wide patristic learning of John of Montenigro, O. P. had convinced Bessarion, Isidore, Dorotheus of Mitylene, Gregory the Emperor's confessor and others, of the orthodoxy of the Latin teaching and of its compatibility with Greek doctrine. These now began to try to persuade their fellows, chiefly Mark of Ephesus, the only man of learning among the Greek clerics who still obdurately refused to acquiesce. The greater part of the Greek prelates, by tradition and sentiment inclined to hold the Latins as heretics, were yet impressed by Montenigro's scholarship, especially in the Greek Fathers, though they were not on a high enough level of theological learning to assess all the arguments. They would follow a lead, and they got not one lead but two — Bessarion and his friends argued to Latin orthodoxy and union; Mark Eugenicus asserted that by Greek tradition the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father only, and so the *Filioque* clause was heretical.

The Greeks, divided among themselves, argued this way and that. Half way through April, Bessarion addressed his « Dogmatic Speech » to the Greek synod — as all saints are inspired by the same Holy Spirit, their teaching, even if expressed differently, must be fundamentally the same. Latin saints declare that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; Greek saints that He proceeds from the Father through the Son. These two assertions must therefore be of identical meaning, so both Churches are orthodox, ' from ' and ' through ' in respect of the Holy Spirit having the same signification. This thesis he demonstrated with copious quotations from the Greek Fathers, specially from those on whom Mark Eugenicus relied to rebut the Latin doctrine.

George Scholarius, a lay theologian in the Emperor's suite, followed with an exhortation in the same sense. The fruits were not immediately seen, but they were not long delayed. Meetings between ten delegates from each side, among whom was Bessarion, towards the end of April brought no result. Then the Latins sent a kind of profession of faith, which the Greeks amended in such a way that the Latins rejected it. A few days later, during a meeting of the Greek clerics with the Patriarch and the Emperor, excerpts from the Fathers were read by Bessarion on the lines of his speech; the prelates approved; all gave their opinions in writing and the upshot was that the Greek synod (always excepting Mark

Eugenicus) accepted the equivalence of 'from' and 'through' in the formula of the Procession of the Holy Spirit and, therefore, the orthodoxy of the Latin doctrine. The first great step to union had been achieved. Unfortunately the general jubilation of the Council was overshadowed by the sudden death on 10 June of the aged Patriarch.

The Greeks would have been willing to consider that the Council had now accomplished its main object and that they therefore could sign a formula of union and depart. The Latins, however, insisted on agreement over the other outstanding points of difference, Purgatory, the primacy of the pope, the effective words of consecration in the Liturgy (the Sacrifice of the Mass) and the legitimacy of the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed. These were treated of mainly by small committees, though there were, at the request of the Greeks, four more public sessions, two on the primacy and two on the Liturgy. There were times when agreement seemed to be an impossibility. In the general despair Bessarion, Isidore and Dorotheus of Mitylene, refusing to abandon hope, stimulated both Pope and Emperor to new endeavours, and discussion was begun again. The Latin method was to present the Greeks with a statement, to let them debate it privately, and then to discuss with them any difficulties that arose from it. The method proved effective. With slight modifications in the Latin statements on Purgatory and the primacy, and the omission of any formal pronouncement on the words of consecration, on which the Greeks were to make a declaration (read by Bessarion before the Latins on 5 July), agreement was reached on all four points. The decree was written in Latin and Greek, Bessarion doubtless having a hand in the process; it was amended to suit the Emperor, and solemnly promulgated on 6 July in a plenary session in the cathedral of Florence, Cardinal Cesarini reading it in Latin and Bessarion in Greek. It was an honour that Bessarion deserved, for he had played a large part in the discussions and negotiations that had led up to it. The Pope gave him a pension of 300 florins annually, to be raised to 600 florins if he resided in the Roman Curia. He returned, however, to Greece with his compatriots, and in his absence he was made a cardinal in the consistory of December 1439. He came back to Italy towards the end of 1440, never to return again to his native land.

Thirty years of life still remained to him, which he spent in various activities entrusted to him by the popes and in furthering the humanism of the time, which gave him also the opportunity of helping many an unfortunate compatriot in exile from the power of the Turks. One of the first things he did was to learn Latin,

in which he acquired great facility. At about this time too he composed his 'Letter to Alexius Lascaris Philanthropinus about the Holy Spirit', at once a short history of certain phases of the Council of Florence and a treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Eugenius IV gave him the revenue of certain monasteries for his upkeep and, after the return of the Curia to Rome, of a site for a suitable residence. Among the abbeys of which he had charge were some under the Basilian rule. In 1446 he summoned their superiors to a General Chapter in Rome to introduce needed reforms, and drew up for their use an epitome of the Rule of St. Basil. A few years later he was empowered to act as visitor of all Greek monasteries in Italy, a task he was eminently fitted for from the fact that he was both a Greek and a monk.

Bessarion had been created Cardinal with the title of the church of the Twelve Apostles. In 1449 he was made Bishop of Sabina, but he retained his interest in his original church where in 1463 he substituted for the secular Canons a community of Friars Minor whose Protector he had become in 1458. In 1449, too, he was appointed legate to reconcile Venice with Milan, and the following year was sent as governor to the turbulent city of Bologna. One of the lasting effects of his rule there was the restoration of the once-famous university which had latterly fallen on evil days. While Bessarion was at Bologna, Constantinople was taken by the Turks (29 May 1453). Thereafter one of his chief preoccupations was to aid his fellow countrymen by fostering every, even faint, prospect of rousing the western princes to a crusade against the Turk, and by assisting unfortunate Greeks, some by providing ransoms to buy them or their families from captivity, others by receiving them in Italy and either giving them work to do or finding them a means of subsistence. It was at this time, too, that he conceived the project of gathering together as many Greek manuscripts as he could so that Greek learning should not perish with the fall of the empire.

Pope Nicholas V died in 1455. In the conclave that followed Bessarion seemed at one time likely to succeed him, but that was not to be. Under Callistus III, relieved of absorbing appointments, he gave himself for a few years to literary work, from which there issued among other things his *In calumniatorem Platonis*. At the death of Callistus (1458), Pius II was elected, an ardent promotor of a crusade against the Turks. In this he found a supporter, equally enthusiastic, in Bessarion. The Pope summoned the Italian States and the Christian princes to a congress at Mantua to arrange the crusade. The response was poor, but, as the German envoys asked for a papal legate to compose the ec-

clesiastical and political differences of their country and organize the levies for the crusade, Bessarion was the papal choice. He crossed the Alps in mid-winter, traversed large areas of Germany and effected reconciliation in Austria and Hungary, but he could not bring the various princes, intent only on their own immediate problems, to combine for a larger cause. He returned to Venice towards the end of 1461, to learn that Thomas Palaeologus had had to abandon his despotate in the Peloponnesus and that his native town of Trebizond had fallen to Turkish arms. But Pius II had not given up his determination to oppose the Turks. He sent Bessarion in 1463 as legate to Venice, where the Cardinal persuaded the Signoria to declare open war on the infidel, and then went with the Venetian fleet to the rendezvous of the crusade at Ancona. He was just in time to greet the Pope who had come in person to assume its direction, before Pius II died (14 August 1464). With his death the crusade died too. It was little consolation to Bessarion that in the previous year he had been made Patriarch of Constantinople, in which capacity he addressed an encyclical letter (27 May 1463) to the Greeks living under Venetian rule, commending to them the union of Florence.

In the conclave that followed, Bessarion was **doyen** of the Sacred College. The new Pope, Paul II, rejected the conditions that the cardinals had drawn up and, as a consequence, his relations with the **doyen** were for a time somewhat strained. Bessarion retired to the abbey of Grottaferrata (he had become its archimandrite in 1462) which greatly benefited by his sojourn there, for he did much to re-establish it both spiritually and temporally and not least to reconstitute its once-famous library. He had not, however, forgotten the cause of Greece in the midst of his private studies and local activities. When the Emperor Frederick III came to Rome, Bessarion urged him to action against the Turks, who, he said, would not and could not cease from war. His warning was justified, for next year (1470) they captured the Venetian island of Negroponte (Euboea) and later attacked Carinthia. Bessarion's residence in Rome became the meeting place of the commission of cardinals appointed to combine a plan to meet the Turkish threat, but the measures started by the Pope were interrupted by his death (26 July 1471).

The new Pope, Sixtus IV, immediately made Bessarion (22 December 1471) his legate *a latere* to bring France, Burgundy and England together in a crusade, but soon his commission was changed to one of more limited scope, the preliminary settlement of outstanding questions between the Holy See and France. The Cardinal, for reasons of health, hesitated for some time before

undertaking the arduous journey. His hope, however, of inducing France to take part in the Holy War, a consequence that might have resulted from a successful issue of his mission, finally led him to accept. But his hopes were not fulfilled. While on his return, he died at Ravenna on 18 November 1472. His body was taken to Rome and solemnly interred in the church of the Twelve Apostles where his tomb can still be seen.

Bessarion was a great man whose name has unjustifiably been blackened. It has been said that his support of the union was the fruit less of convinction than of ambition and of desire for papal rewards. The only proof ever offered of this assertion is the fact that actually he was given a pension and made a cardinal by Eugenius IV. That apart (and by itself it proves nothing), there is no incident in any contemporary document, not even in the bitter *Memoirs* of Syropoulus, that would suggest that Bessarion acted from any less worthy motive.

That he changed his views goes without saying. He began persuaded of the traditional opinions of his Church; he ended convinced by the arguments of the Latins, predisposed perhaps somewhat for this by a correspondence he had had before the Council with Andrew Chrysoberges, O. P., (Latin Archbishop of Rhodes) about the theology of hesychasm, which had made him wonder if the official approval given to this by the Eastern Church was altogether sound — if it could be wrong on one point, it might be wrong on another. He did not disguise his change of opinion. His 'Dogmatic Oration' of April 1439 was at once a proclamation openly made to the whole of the Greek synod that he had come to hold that the Latin doctrine was as sound as their traditional faith, and an exposition of the theological reasons for his belief: it ended with a declaration that he would ever be true to his convictions, even if that brought persecution. His subsequent action in the Council, and indeed for the rest of his life, was the logical fruit of his faith.

Yet, even though he was soon held by many of his leading countrymen as a traitor both to his religion and to his fatherland, he was in fact one of his country's best friends. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453 Bessarion was ever active, through diplomatic missions, in letters, by personal contact, trying to persuade the western powers to realise that the destruction of the Byzantine empire would be but the prelude to Turkish designs on their territories, and that the danger of attack was imminent and immense. For their own sakes they must compose their differences and unite, in order to thrust the Mohammedan peril out of Europe. In so doing, they would restore Constantinople to the

Greeks. The fact that the western princes were so involved in their own quarrels as to be blind to the larger issues defeated all of Bessarion's endeavours. But he was not to blame for that, nor was a succession of popes who likewise urged unity and the crusade, but in vain.

The Greek exiles also, and there were many of them, received the benefit of his patriotism. Not only did he supervise the education of the three orphan children of Thomas Palaeologus, but he aided with money, with counsel and, very often, with patient restraint many others seeking a living in the new country. Some of these, with Latin humanists, met regularly in his residence and formed his 'Academy', by whose means the translation, conservation and study of treasures of Greek literature and philosophy were greatly advanced. The Cardinal, in the course of years, spent large sums of money on buying and copying manuscripts and the (for those days) rich library that he thus acquired he gave before he died to St. Marks, Venice (1468), as a token of gratitude to that city for its constant goodwill towards him and so as to keep his collection of books together and make it more accessible to his compatriots, for Venice was the nearest great port to Greece and had a large colony of Greeks resident there. Not only his contemporaries, but posterity too, has reason to be grateful for his wise forethought.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC RELATIONS IN GERMANY

Politico-Religious Difficulties

Pessimistic observers feared an increase of inter-Confessional tension as a result of the Bonn Republic election campaign of last year. Frank Eyck, writing in the *Contemporary Review,* has greatly exaggerated the difficulties which could arise between Catholics and Protestants in this political arena. It must be stressed, however, that this uneasiness has not had any direct effect on the religious world. Despite the attempts of the Social-Democrats to present their party as the sole champion of Protestantism, the Evangelical Church has stated that nobody in conscience need vote for any particular party, or even vote at all. The electors were quite free to choose. This attitude of complete neutrality is an expression of the independence which the church has enjoyed since 1945. This freedom in all matters of doctrine and internal organization has come as a real revolution which coincided with the overthrow of Nazism. During the Hitler régime a « Confessional Church » had successfully opposed the unhappy compromise of « German Christians » who were Hitlerite partisans. After opposing totalitarianism, this church strove to regain its liberty from the State. The setting up of the Bonn Republic helped it towards achieving this end.

However, years of opposition to Nazism have embittered certain representatives of that church, and has led them to adopt rather extreme attitudes. Hence the curious reaction of Pastor Niemoeller; one finds in him a tendency to regard the State as the incarnation of evil ever since he adopted an absolute pacifism. His anti-Catholicism which he showed again on the occasion of His Holiness's last Christmas message can be partially explained by this fixation. However, since his co-religionists have discovered that he has adopted very different criteria for judging events on the two sides of the Iron Curtain, they have lost confidence in him. His constant anti-Papalism and his efforts to establish friendly relations with the Patriarchate of Moscow have been increasingly considered as tactical manoeuvres inspired by political

rather than religious motives. And that is why the leaders of the Council of Foreign Relations of the Evangelical Church have become diffident towards him, and have turned instead to Pastor Wischmann. Dr. Niemoeller's supporters are becoming fewer and fewer, and their increasing weakness cannot but benefit good relations between separated Christians.

One can only conclude that in the politico-religious sphere Protestants and Catholics alike share precisely the same problems. The question of re-armament seemed to make a division between them; although the Evangelical Church had provided military chaplaincies it feared that the creation of armed forces would militate against the re-unification of the country. And in this connection it must be remembered that the Reformed Lutheran Church of the Republic of Pankow numbered some 15,660,000 faithful, politically separated from their brethren in the West although united in the same religious faith. And the yearning for political unity is intense. As Bishop Dibelius has said, « In the whole of Germany one cannot find a single sincere Protestant who is prepared to accept the Oder-Neisse frontier as a permanency ». However, these legitimate political aspirations and tensions on the temporal plane do not seem to interfere with good relations between separated brethren. On the contrary, the co-operation of Catholics and Protestants in West Germany, often united in the same political parties, is being constantly strengthened.

In the area of dispute which opposes the neutralists against the partisans in the Bonn Government, Dr. Hans Asmussen has been playing an important role. Before the last General Synod of the Evangelical Church, the Fraternities, which are foyers of neutrality, had proposed to the Assembly a program of ten points urging that the churches take a stand, in the name of the Gospel, against the adoption of atomic weapons in the federal army. To this proposal Dr. Asmussen replied by publishing ten counter theses. « Whoever », he declared, « wishes to make of the Synod an instrument of propaganda for a determined policy destroys at one and the same time the Synod and Parliament ». He accused the neutralists in their preoccupation of putting the body before the soul and politics before religion. He concluded his manifesto with these words: « If theologians neglect their proper mission and play politics, then we are delivering ourselves over to an irremediable disorder ».

Unfortunately, the prediction of Probst Asmussen is apparently being fulfilled in the Eastern Zone. There a certain number of ' progressive ' ministers, not content with supporting the position of Niemoeller, uphold the policy of the Pankow Government.

Recently the foundation of an « Association of Evangelical Ministers » was announced in East Germany. The head of the new group is the Reverend Kleinschmidt de Schwerin, who is known for his sympathy towards the Communist Party. His associates are a group of eleven clergymen, all of the same tendency. The Minister of Public Education supports and subsidizes their activities. As one of its principal aims, the Association proposes to defend ' progressive ' ministers against the disciplinary measures which could be adopted in their regard by the authorities of the Evangelical Church. There is evident apprehension that this trend may end up with a schism in the Protestant Church of East Germany.

Progress in the Spiritual Life

From the point of view of unity, it is more profitable to emphasise the renewal of the spiritual life in German Protestantism, as Mgr. Doepfner, the Catholic Bishop of Berlin, has done in a recent statement. A young and active élite is working amidst an indifferent majority in a resolute attempt to arouse it. The cultus of the « German Mass » has been put back in the place of honour. The liturgy and sacraments have again found their place in Lutheran worship. It is well known that since the last *Kirchentag* a study-group has devoted its efforts to a fruitful research on private confession. Their researches have shown that Luther had never opposed the acknowledgment of a sacramental value given to an absolution imparted by a confessor. Hence the practice of penance seems to be on the increase. And if one admits that this progress is due to a deepening study of scriptural teaching and of the doctrine of the early Reformers, one can see the importance of this revival.

The Protestant laity, moreover, are not strangers to this development. Those who were present at the meeting of the « Evangelical Academies » did not fail to notice the zeal and industry of those who were concerned with matters of the spiritual life. During the sessions of these Academies the problems of social order were the object of earnest study; the evangelization of the working classes was on their agenda. Thus, the Social Academy of Friedewald multiplied its contacts with professional circles. Other projects working towards the same goal have been started, such as the Evangelical Workers Circle of Hesse-Nassau, and the *Gossnermission* of Mainz-Kastel. These enterprises are beginning to bear fruit, and Protestant workers are learning to see their Church in a new light, no longer for the benefit only of the

Kirchensteuer. The Protestant German working class, weaned from Marxism, has not yet been converted, however, and plenty of Socialist leaders urge that the Evangelical Church is linked with capitalism as it had been previously linked with the throne. From this point of view the forced abandonment of the Lutheran principle *cujus regio ejus religio* is all to the good.

Another revival activity deserves consideration, and that is the increased interest in the Gospel precepts and the founding of religious communities. Who has not already heard of the Institute of the Sisters of Mary at Darmstadt, which resulted from a biblical study-group in which certain devout young women pondered over Our Lord's words « Come and follow me »? Communities of men share the same ideals of penitence and poverty. These communities often form the nuclei of liturgical prayer and ecumenical activity, comparable to the splendid monastery of Taizé which many of our readers already know and appreciate. It goes without saying that all sincere Christians will rejoice and offer their prayers for these Institutes, that God's blessing may ever rest upon them. For is not the life which these monks and religious lead, devoted to meditation on the Word of God, a continuous sermon? The fervour of this revival which we are witnessing springs from putting into practice those counsels of perfection which Christian tradition has bequeathed to us. It is perhaps more important for the future of German Protestantism than all the efforts made for the improvement of preaching. The future of this preaching, which is of course the chief function of the pastorate, is moreover bound up with the future of theology. So it is only fitting that we should dwell briefly upon those movements which are becoming apparent in this important field.

Barth and the Critique of Liberalism.

In his recent *Dogmatik*, H. Diem appears to have successfully pin-pointed the main problem with which contemporary Protestant theology is struggling. This problem is that of the demythologising exegesis as opposed to dogma, or in other words, that of rationalism as opposed to Lutheran theology.

As is well known, the great merit of Karl Barth is his successful reaction against that liberalism which was rampant at the beginning of the century. In rising up against the destructive rationalism of Harnack, he has rendered an invaluable service to Protestantism. Moreover, his revolutionary effort has been well received by truly religious souls.

Determined to take the Bible in earnest in expounding its

fundamental character, he dealt a fatal blow to that humanism upheld by partisans of the liberal school of thought. For Holy Scripture witnesses to the Word of God. And although it is a human word, according to Barth, it is none the less the means by which God speaks to us, and the channel through which the Holy Spirit intervenes in our souls. In fact, the theologian of Basle in no way identifies the scriptural message with the Word of God. In his teaching the Word of God is not distinct from God Himself, and is confused with His work of redemption. It is identified with grace and with revelation. It is a mysterious event through which God knows man. It acts therefore only intermittently. It is by faith alone that we can respond to God when He speaks to us. However, because of our state of sinful creatureliness we can never lay claim to a direct knowledge of God, but only to the contemplation of the veil which hides the transcendent reality from us. Faith in the Barthian sense, therefore, is not an act by which we know God, but an act in which God knows us, although it is impossible for us to be conscious of it.

To make himself the champion of the absolute sovereignty of Christ, and of the divine transcendence, Barth made God a being incapable of communicating Himself. By way of response, man has only one recourse — to abandon himself in a blind trust. He takes this chance with the hope of finding in the Bible an indirect knowledge of the Word of God. His sinful condition gives him no other approach to revelation than this leap into the unknown. In this way Karl Barth stands between agnosticism and fideism. His most ardent disciples have reproached him for his radical attitude; Emile Brunner found himself obliged to oppose him with a less pessimistic anthropology, although in conformity with the Protestant tradition.

Barth has remained unmoved by these cautious criticisms. He wishes thus to uphold and safeguard the sovereignty and autonomy of God as against His creation, as if the divine transcendence were inseparable from incommunicability, and as if it were enough to abase man in order to exalt the Creator. In one of his intuitions the poet Peguy understood perfectly that it could not be thus: « It is not enough to abase human nature in order to raise oneself to the sphere of grace », he wrote. « It is not enough to abase the world that we may rise to the divine order ».

There is such dualism in Barth's doctrine, such a misconception of the doctrine of the Incarnation, that cautious critics such as Rilliet and Hamer have seen in him a guiding influence from the existentialist Kierkegaard. And indeed when one examines his latest writings, it appears that he has certainly managed to

lean towards this position in his exaggerated development of the erroneous principles of Protestantism.

Nevertheless, in order to form an impartial judgment of the work of Karl Barth, I would refer my readers to the monumental study which Fr. Henri Bouillard, S. J. has just dedicated to the well-known theologian (1). The work itself is more a meeting of minds, or a dialogue, undertaken by two theologians rather than a verdict or a judgment pronounced by one against the other. Karl Barth himself has on several occasions received the historian of his thought in order to converse with him and to offer him many a clarification of the sense of his assertions, as well as to discuss the difficulties met with in his statements. Thanks to this fruitful exchange we are henceforth in possession of a good introduction to Barthian theology. For one thing, we can safely aver that, over and above the multiple changes of orientation, Barth has probably remained faithful to a fundamental intuition. From dialectical theology to his remarkable efforts to disengage a consistent Christology, there is evident the same fidelity to the Word of God, together with all that Protestant theology conceives of the subject of this reality.

« God is God », writes Fr. Bouillard, « while man is a sinner. Even though justified, he remains a sinner. But even so, he does not recognize himself as a sinner except in the measure that, through faith, he knows himself to be justified. Simul peccator et justus. It is around this axiom, interpreted in terms of the work of Christ, that the basic and constant idea of Karl Barth revolves ». It is undoubtedly this essentially Protestant basis that gives the Swiss theologian the possibility of exercising a preponderant influence over all the Reformed circles.

Bultmann and Demythologization

If Karl Barth possesses the great merit of opposing liberalism, we cannot but deplore the increasing influence of Bultmann. For he exemplifies the aggressive return of that rationalism which one thought had been discredited forever. A brief summary of the sources of demythology as preached by Bultmann would show us that this teaching is much less original than one might think.

The rationalists indeed have not waited for the atomic era to conclude that the Christian message is incompatible with modern

---

(1) Henri Bouillard, *Karl Barth,* 3 volumes, Paris: Editions Aubier. Cf. also H. Davis, « The Essence of Barthism », in the *Downside Review,* 1950, pp. 131-146.

thought. Bultmann, however, manages to give a new direction to this alleged opposition between Christianity and contemporary science. He maintains that the New Testament account of the facts of salvation is itself impregnated with mythological thought. He goes so far as to state that the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction implies a rather barbarous conception of the Deity. For him, the pre-scientific imagery of the New Testament is completely inadmissible to our contemporaries. Hence the necessity of « de-mythologising » the Christian message, and of purifying it from every appearance of anthropomorphism.

What does this de-mythologising consist of? It asks us to reject as unauthentic everything in the Bible which does not express our existential position of dependence as regards God. It stands completely on the philosophical method of Martin Heidegger. It leads us to consider an existential interpretation of the New Testament. This shows us exactly the position of existence in faith; that is, a liberation of man due to the gifts which God made him in Jesus Christ. Again one must de-mythologise this fact of our salvation to make it acceptable to our contemporaries. Even though Bultmann admits the historicity of the death of Our Lord on the cross, he none the less rejects the Resurrection as a mythical event. Maimed in this fashion, the fact of salvation becomes our own by faith in the preaching of the Church. Bultmann has moreover an awareness thus to respect the Lutheran doctrine of salvation by faith alone. This leads mankind to an authentic existence by stopping him from dwelling on its mythical clothing and making the Christian message objective, even though deprived of a great deal of its traditional content.

In a recent essay devoted to Bultmann's theology, Fr. Malevez S. J. tried in a most irenic spirit to understand the theologian's meaning, and to show the various benefits which Christian doctrine might gain from it. Unhappily the benefits are far less than the disadvantages to which de-mythology exposes the Christian message. The most serious of these reproaches is that it empties the Gospel by depriving the Christian of the living presence of the risen Christ. This defect is indeed all the more serious because there is no real reason that could justify Bultmann in making these fundamental rejections of the supernatural. In fact, present-day science does not absolutely exclude the possibility of a divine intervention in history. As it is engaged solely in the study of natural phenomena, it can in no wise be opposed to the existence of a reality which is beyond the world of phenomena. Reason no longer rejects the possibility of a miraculous event, because far from being a violation of the laws of nature, it is an exception

willed by the divine omnipotence in order to reveal an order higher than the phenomenal.

For a long time Catholic theologians and many scholars have been examining this problem and have stated it far better than Bultmann. He is moreover far from being free from inconsistencies. Once he has stated the principles of de-mythologising without giving their precise import he runs a perilous risk of being overtaken on the road to rejection and of shutting the door to the supernatural. Several of his disciples have taken his principles to their logical conclusions. Fritz Buri, for instance, does not hesitate to deny the whole objective nature of salvation, thus emptying faith of its content. This danger fully justifies the criticism recently levelled by a Protestant theologian: « The disciples of Bultmann have the choice of either becoming Catholics or of foundering in unbelief ».

Asmussen and the Renewal Movement

The religious authorities of the Evangelical Church, in their reaction against the dangers of Bultmann's position, have shown that the traditional doctrine of the Reformers still has its vitality. In spite of the adage *Reformata, Reformanda,* it continues to be emphasised in the teaching of many theologians. It has profited from the studies which eminent historians have devoted to the thought of the Reformers.

Many different points of view are evident in this fresh reassessment . Thus in 1949 Dr. Asmussen devoted a praiseworthy monograph to the Augsburg Confession, *Warum noch lutherische Kirche? Ein Gespraech mit den Augsburgischen Bekentniss.* The author in his patent endeavour to bring the Reformation message up to date shows a tendency to rediscover those elements which formed an integral part of the common Christian inheritance. In his more recent book *Rom-Wittenberg-Moskau* (1956) he shows this same purpose; he emphasises the efforts which Luther made to reconcile his teaching with the Councils and with the doctrine of St. Bernard.

This theologian who was a member of the Confessional Church under the Nazi régime has never ceased to be the champion of universalism. He is the guiding light of *Die Sammlung* which includes well-known names such as Lackmann, Fincke, Lehman, Huhn, and Richard Baumann, the author of *Fels der Welt,* which makes an interesting contribution to the study of primitive Rome. This group has published a series of tracts, of which the latest has particularly attracted attention in Catholic circles. Newspapers

like *La Croix* have noted it, and Fr. Dumont has made some invaluable comments on it in the excellent review *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne* published by the Istina organization. Members of *Die Sammlung* give a summary of their views in a concise manifesto. In it they repeat that their task is the rediscovery of those truths which the Evangelical Church has lost throughout the centuries through a sterile exclusiveness. They enumerate certain « Catholic » truths which are universally admitted by Christians. They deal with the mysteries of the Christian faith, and especially with the mystery of the Church. They stress the necessity of a hierarchical ministry and a ruling jurisdiction within the ecclesiastical community. They maintain the obligation of accepting the principles of tradition and authority.

In their scriptural formularies the theses set forth in this tract give plentiful food for reflection among theologians of the Reform. Fr. C. J. Dumont has good reason to make certain reservations in his commentary on the criterion suggested in this manifesto. However, we believe that the value of these theses depends mainly on the fact that they express the results of a novel exegesis. Pastor Asmussen and the members of his circle have often reproached their Church with not taking recent discoveries in this sphere into account. Now in order to safeguard the Word of God in its integrity, the Evangelical Church must assimilate those elements which a fresh study of the Biblical message has reconstructed.

From this point of view the efforts of *Die Sammlung* come into line with the preoccupations of a reformed Church. They show not so much a tendency towards Catholicism as a sincere desire to be faithful to the Word of God. And if this leads the Evangelical Church to a fortunate meeting-ground with Rome, that will be above all the response to the necessity for a rediscovery of the integrity of that message. Many reformers believe that the Roman Church has always been zealous for the Gospels. Thus W. Von Loewenich, who can hardly be suspected of an exaggerated regard for Catholicism, admits this fact in *Der Moderne Katholizismus*. This witness may well favour a confessional rapprochement and the work which *Die Sammlung* have taken up.

It may be objected that Pastor Asmussen's circle is a very limited one, and that its actual influence is small. It is clear, however, that it is an important and thoughtful movement which first started out to form a limited élite. This élite many well be destined to help Protestantism in its recovery of certain traditions, to become again more sacramental and more firm in its doctrine, to live

the Word of God in its fulness, and come nearer to an integral Christianity.

In the last of the circular letters of the « Gathering » (*Die Sammlung*), it was announced that a collective volume would soon be published, exposing more fully the positions defended by the group. This book has appeared under the significant title: *The Catholicity of the Church* (*Die Katholizitätder Kirche*). But what appears to us even more significant is the choice of the questions examined by the collaborators of this important study. Such a selection manifests the evident sollicitude of giving due value to the ensemble of those universal truths which form the common patrimony of Christianity. These questions naturally lend themselves to a fruitful ecumenical dialogue. Thus it is that Dr. Ernst Kinder studies the relation between Scripture and Tradition in order to show that there is no reason obliging us to oppose these two sources of belief: the Word of God is offered to us in the Church through the medium of Tradition. Other problems just as fundamental approached by theologians of real worth are the relation between the Word and Sacrament; the method of writing ecclesiastical history; the necessity of canon law; the theology of history. Dr. Oscar Plank presents an important contribution to the study by exploring our relations with the next world, the angels, the Saints ,and the souls of the departed.

Two principal issues which make themselves felt through the pages of this work are the value of Christian Baptism and that of the Evangelical ministry. We find these questions particularly emphasised in the chapter entitled: « Catholicity, Protestantism, and Catholicism », where Wilhelm Staehlin attempts to demonstrate that the faithful of Rome and Protestants belong to the same Catholicity by virtue of the Sacrament of Christian initiation, despite their historical opposition. We find the matter discussed again in the studies dealing with the equality and inequality in the Body of Christ and with the pastoral ministry of our time. It is, in addition, explicitly stressed in the questionnaire of five points, a manifesto that is highly regarded by those who esteem the sincerity of Pastor Asmussen.

This questionnaire, addressed to the Church of Rome, bears on the value of Protestant Baptism and its effects as well as on the significance of the Lord's Supper and of the ministry. If the Catholic Church recognizes the validity of Protestant Baptism when the matter and form of the Sacrament are respected, the same is not the case for the Lord's Supper and the ministry. In effect, only those can celebrate the Eucharist who have been legitimately ordained by a validly consecrated bishop. The authentic priesthood,

therefore, supposes the apostolic succession. The break brought about by the Protestant Reformation had as a deplorable effect the rejection of the Sacrament of Orders by the suppression of the true episcopate. From this point of view, the break with Rome has been more disastrous to Protestantism than to Orthodoxy which has conserved an authentic priesthood. Dr. Asmussen does not ignore this fact, just as he does not ignore that the best way of launching forth into an ecumenical dialogue is to pose a certain number of questions of general interest and thus prepare for a genuine *rapprochement of minds and hearts.*

The Attitude of the Evangelical Church

The work of the *Die Sammlung* circle has already borne fruit. While recognising their apparent lack of success the members of this group take satisfaction in the fact that the questions raised in their tracts have thus been brought to the attention of the Church authorities. They have insisted that even the question of the Roman Church, the vital problem, has not escaped them. Thus their efforts are far from fruitless.

A recent event has shown them to be right. We know that the German representatives were influential at the General Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation at Chicago last August. The former President of this organization, Dr Hans Lilje, Bishop of Hanover, put forward a project with a view to setting up an institute devoted to the study of Catholic theology. To support this idea Bishop Lilje declared: « Each generation of Protestants must reconsider the historic decision of the 16th century; we must be capable of saying why we are not Roman Catholics today ». After remarking that the Roman Church is not the same today as it was in Luther's time, the Bishop added: « We want the truth, even if it is unpalatable ». Undoubtedly, a greater mutual understanding among separated brethren will favour a general *rapprochement* among Christians. And even though the intervention of Pastor Vajta of Geneva showed a much less irenic spirit in the debate on this scheme, one can but rejoice in Dr. Hans Lilje's initiative.

The German Evangelical Church includes further reformed and united communities alongside the Lutheran Church. Its organization is complex; it rests on a sort of federation of regional Churches. These, twenty-eight in number, have differing structures united under various administrative bodies, the Synod the Conference, and the Council which corresponds to an executive directorship, elected for a fixed period of time. The present President of the Council is Bishop Dibelius, whose qualities have won uni-

versal admiration. His thought accurately reflects the views of his Church. He himself has affirmed that the sufferings of the late war have brought Catholics and Protestants closer together, and he has never shown any signs of hostility to this *rapprochement*. One has only to remember his visit to the Sovereign Pontiff when he visited Rome in January 1956 to be convinced of this. Pastor Asmussen hailed this visit as a historic event, and indeed it would have been unthinkable not many years ago. However, in spite of these portents profound differences still remain in the field of dogma, which form the fundamental obstacle to unity. But they do not prevent ecumenical studies, nor the will to work for the sublime cause of unity .

If these significant attempts are being made on the Protestant side, one must remember also that Catholics are rivalling their separated brethren. Regular meetings are organised between Evangelical and Catholic theologians under the direction of Mgr. Jaeger and Bishop Staehlin. The *Una Sancta* movement, too, perseveres in its labours for unity. The instigator of these activities is Fr. Thomas Sartory, who has devoted an active life to the Ecumenical Movement. His spirit is sympathetic to every problem which may assail the Protestant conscience, and his knowledge of thousands of Protestants is invaluable for the future of this movement. And again, the soaring progress of the Catholic renewal of interest in Biblical studies cannot but be favourable to the irenic climate in Germany.

A reflection of the ecumenical spirit in Germany can be seen from the discussion which took place between Catholic and Protestant theologians early in March at the Evangelical Academy of Loccum. The conversations were described as frank but friendly. As its biblical theme the conference chose to explore the priestly prayer of Christ. On each evening, too, Compline was sung in common in the Abbey chapel by Catholic and Protestant alike.

The Ecumenical Press bulletin mentions the following as taking part in the Loccum meeting: (representing the Protestant side) Professor Karl Steck of Frankfurt, Professor D. Heinz-Horst Schrey of Berlin, and Dr. Bolewski, director of the Loccum Academy; attending as Catholic representatives were: Dr. Thomas Sartory, O. S. B., editor of the review *Una Sancta*, Professor Johann B. Hirschmann, S. J. of Frankfurt, and Dr. Aloert Brandeburg of the Johann Adam Möhler Institute at Paderborn.

The *E. P .S.* bulletin recalls in reporting the event that at the end of the seventeenth century the Academy at Loccum was also the scene of a conference of Catholics and Lutherans who were

desirous of restoring Christian unity, the most prominent of whom were Bossuet, Leibniz, and Abbot Molanos.

The Persecuted Churches

In a recent declaration Bishop Dibelius, who has been refused entrance to the Eastern zone, has proclaimed that the persecutions and sufferings endured by Christians has brought them closer together in the same love and in the same faith in Christ. It is fortunate that such is the case in the Republic of Pankow where Protestants and Catholics are forced to submit to the assaults of a persecuting power. The gravest threat is seen to be in the estrangement of youth from religious influences enforced by every possible means. Thus a campaign of intensive propaganda supported by the Communist government has just started up for the « Consecration of youth », the deplorable effects of which are becoming known. Last year the recruiting campaign took on a violently anti-religious character. On September 29 at Sonneberg in Thuringia, Vice-President Ulbricht declared war on the Christian religion by declaring that « the scientific explanations and discoveries of those engaged in research must not be stifled beneath the rubbish and twaddle of a former age ». Religious authorities naturally protested against this crude attack. On October 13 an encyclical from the Protestant Bishops was proclaimed aloud from every pulpit. It protested against the support officially given by the State to this anti-religious ceremony, and reminded the faithful that participation in this « Consecration of Youth » would be regarded as an act of apostasy. The Minister of the Interior for Pankow reacted sharply to this declaration by the Protestant Bishops. He reproached them for slandering the State, and setting up an opposition « against the Workers and ' Peasants ' government ». He protested finally against the comparison made between the « Consecration » and Nazi methods of regimenting youth.

Catholics for their part also waged a valiant fight and took part in the resistance side by side with the Protestants. The clergy in all the Churches of East Germany read a pastoral letter from the Bishops of the Eastern zone, renewing their condemnation of the *Jugendweihe,* and denouncing the pressure put upon the pupils of secondary and senior schools to prevent them attending religious instruction.

As is already known, the great *Kirchentag* which was to have taken place in Thuringia had to be cancelled because of opposition from the Pankow authorities. They had already shown their hostility to the appointment of military chaplains in the army of the

Federal Republic. The *Kirchentag* was replaced by thirty groups organised by the local authorities in various places. The largest of these was in Essen, where sixty thousand people took part in the closing sessions. At last these meetings were stopped on October 27 of last year, after the conference of three thousand delegates in Berlin. The Ecumenical Press agency announced that the next *Kirchentag* would take place in Munich.

In this connection we like to recall how Catholics have been affected by these difficulties which the Evangelical Church faced in organising its conferences. The *Rheinischer Merkur* even declared that Catholics would give up their annual assembly in Berlin if the Pankow government's attitude continued to seek to break the solidarity which united the Christian bodies. Such a policy would not succeed, continued that journal, because that solidarity was « difficult to overthrow, and laid the foundation of a future better for all parties ».

These provocations against the Church reached a climax in the recent past. The matter of « traffic in currencies » reminds us of the time when Hitler tried by every possible means to discredit the Churches. One of these methods was to accuse ministers of religion of compromising themselves in financial scandals. The Pankow government thought good to renew these methods. As is well known , the churches of Western Germany collected large sums of money to keep Eastern German parishes alive when they were deprived of everything they had and made subject to pressure from a persecuting government. To transmit this money to its destination they were able to change it at a favourable rate at the Western banks which gave four Eastern marks to one Western. This perfectly normal procedure is called an illicit traffic in currency by the Communists. Two prominent Protestants, Kurt Gruenbaum and Siegfried Klewitz, were arrested in October at the time of monetary changes manipulated by the Pankow authorities, for having tried to introduce clandestinely 400,000 Eastern marks in order to change them.

What was a matter of a charitable gesture to a sister Church in need was presented by the Communists as a plot directed against the State. And such accusations were multiplied against the Evangelical Church, and more particularly against Bishop Dibelius. These attempts to discredit those who are symbols of resistance to Marxism have, however, no chance of success. The courageous old man who continues to struggle for the defence of the faith is firmly established in the respect and admiration of every German. Each time the Communists try to destroy his reputation, Protestants

of the two Germanies rally to the support of their spiritual leader and renew their expressions of confidence in him.

This could be seen once again on the occasion of the General Synod of the Evangelical Church. Convoked in an atmosphere of nervous anxiety, the Synod opened its sessions on April 26 with a service celebrated in the Marienkirche in East Berlin. Among the 120 delegates, forty were from the Democratic Republic. Following the service, the participants met in the conference room of the Stöcker Foundation where Bishop Dibelius presented his report on the two subjects which formed the order of the day for the Assembly: « The Church and Education » and « The Problem of Atomic Armament ». It is well known that the Communist government of Pankow has been exerting an intolerable pressure on the Christian parents in obliging their children to submit to the atheistic profession of faith of the *Jugendweihe*. Accordingly, in the course of his address, Bishop Dibelius, whose courage at times is heroic, denounced the anti-religious campaign. « It is a veritable miracle », he declared, « if one can still find families who resist it ».

During the reading of this report, Communist demonstrators met outside the auditorium in order to interrupt the proceedings. Seven of them succeeded in entering the conference room and called for the abolition of the military chaplainship. Visibly impressed by the spiritual atmosphere of the gathering, they left only when Bishop Dibelius had terminated his address. This incident gave rise to a violent campaign in the press and to further pressure against the members of the Evangelical Church. Dr. Krüger, director of the Political Institute of Karl Marx University at Leipzig, even declared that all the support given to the carrying out of the military chaplaincy was in reality an attempt against the security of the State. Provocative pamphlets against the Evangelical Church were likewise published by Communist newspapers. In *Neues Deutschland,* Albert Norden concluded his article against Bishop Dibelius in this way: « As long as this anti-Semite, politician of the atomic bomb, officiates as pope of NATO, he will reduce the Church to the role of an instrument of war and of reaction ». Other violent attacks did not fail to impress the members of the Synod.

In reality, the problem of nuclear weapons is one which has divided Protestants in Germany. An anti-government wing, animated by the Evangelical Fraternities, Pastor Niemöller, Professors Iwand and Gollwitzer, is opposed to the maintenance of a chaplainship in an army provided with atomic weapons. This is why the Synod attempted in a particular way to maintain the unity of the Evangelical Church. In order to avert division, it manifested a great deal of moderation. In reference to the *Jugendweihe* and

atheistic schools, the Synod decided that a delegation of three members would consult with the Government of Pankow « in order to express to it the anxiety of Christians with regard to the education of their children ». A compromise was also reached on the question of the military chaplaincy and nuclear armaments.

Despite the moderate stand of the Synod, the Communist press did not diminish its attacks. The *Neues Deutschland*, for instance, declared that « a synod which supports the chaplaincy (in an army furnished with atomic weapons) has ceased to be the legitimate representation of Christians ».

Marxist demonstrators, moreover, were successful in disrupting the sessions of the Evangelical synod at Mecklembourg. By such tactics the authorities of Pankow hope to eventually bring about a break between the Christians of East and West Germany.

On the Catholic side the same kind of persecution has been verified. Mgr. Doepfner, the Bishop of Berlin has been prevented access to the eastern part of his diocese; a school for children at Stralsund has recently been closed; and the Communist press has continued the reproaches against Catholics which it lately directed against Protestants. It is therefore Christianity as a whole that the Pankow regime is attacking. Thus it is that Christians of all confessions are united in prayer and love in order to resist the dangers of persecution and the oppression of conscience. May the Lord sustain them in their hour of trial which will not fail to draw them together in a fraternal bond.

It is not to be doubted that in this resistance to the forces of evil Catholics and Protestants will find a providential means of seeing ever more clearly all that which unites them and all that should strengthen the bonds between separated brethren, in expectation of that glorious day when there will be but one fold under one Shepherd.

JEROME CORNELIS, A. A.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An Allocution of Pope Pius XII on Eastern Monasticism

Besides being an important link between Rome and the separated Eastern Churches, monasticism is invested with certain fundamental values that have a profound appeal for other Christian bodies as well. This interest, in fact, is reflected by the resurgence of the religious life in late years among Anglican and Protestant groups, particularly in Europe.

Early in April, an international congress was held in Rome, dedicated to studies on Eastern monasticism. On this occasion, the Holy Father received in audience the participants of the congress and addressed them in French on the subject to which they were giving their consideration. Believing that our readers will find the Pope's words on this theme interesting, we are printing below an English version of his address:

We are happy to receive you at this joyful Easter season, beloved sons, and to express to you Our congratulations on the success of the congress which has brought you together for the purpose of studying the different aspects of Eastern monasticism. From the program which you have presented Us, We noted first of all an historical section dealing with Slavic, Byzantine, Syrian, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic, and Ethiopian monasticism; then a juridical section illustrating the *Motu Proprio, Postquam Apostolicis Litteris,* which We issued in 1952; and finally, synthetic views on the important role of monasticism in the Eastern Church, and on the monastic spirit and Christian unity. These several surveys are a sufficient indication of the interest of your efforts and the scope of the questions which claim your attention.

Thanks be to God, the progress of historical sciences and of the methods of investigation greatly facilitate a salutary return to the sources in this domain, as in many others; and if the dramatic events which have succeeded each other in the East since the origins of monasticism have been the occasion of formidable trials for the latter — and sometimes of regrettable deviations — still

we must rejoice at all that can be a source of light and of encouragement to the generous initiatives destined to give it splendor and fecondity once again.

The Origins of Monasticism

« From the beginning of Christianity », We stated in the *Motu Proprio, Postquam Apostolicis Litteris,* « monks have been radiant in the garden of the Church, like freshly blossomed flowers. Faithful to the inspirations of grace, overcoming the concupiscences which form an obstacle to the spiritual life, inflamed with love for God and man, they gave themselves over to the attainment of evangelical perfection. Anchorites and cenobites, in prayer and contemplation, in bodily mortifications, and in the exercise of other virtues, they joyfully scaled the mountain of God ». (*A.A.S.*, 1952, p. 65).

It is pleasing to observe that the effloresence of monasticism corresponds to the rapid expansion of Christianity which followed the end of the era of persecution; and the documents of that period show, in effect, the elan of generous souls towards that new form of perfection — a kind of volontary martyrdom destined to replace the one of blood, the hope of which was disappearing. It is fitting, however, to note that even before the Constantinian peace, fervent Christians fled from the world and gave themselves over in private life to ascetical practices, while others sought out in the desert the complete renunciation of the pleasures of a corrupt civilization. The supernatural example of a few great figures like St. Paul the Hermit and St. Antony drew away into the solitudes of the Thebaid or into the monasteries of Palestine and of Syria, ever larger numbers of imitators who became the spiritual sons of these first Fathers of the desert.

Among the counsels of the Divine Master to His disciples, that of perfect chastity, consecrated by His virginal birth, found from the first Christian generations a fervent echo in pure souls. The continence of that epoch flourished as one of the fruits of the Holy Spirit and constituted one of the most evident signs of the profound transformation which Christianity was bringing about in the world; but it gave rise to a redoubtable spiritual combat on the part of those who wished to conserve it. In order to remain chaste, was it not absolutely necessary to flee the world? The Gospel suggested the means of a great force to avoid sin, especially sins of the flesh: « ... anyone who even looks with lust at a woman has already committed adultery with her in his heart. So if thy right eye is an oc-

casion of sin to thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee ... » (Matthew, 5, 28- 29). And how how could one practice more perfectly the beatifying poverty of the Gospel than in solitude where there is nothing but God alone? Furthermore, did not the Old and New Testaments give several examples of a volontary withdrawal in order to find the Creator in the midst of silence? It is therefore in the footsteps of Moses and Elias, of John the Baptist, of Jesus Himself, and of St. Paul following his conversion that the friends of God would seek Him out in the desert. But the audacity of these heroic Christians was to establish their abode there permanently and in prayer and penitence to await there the day of their deliverance and their definitive meeting with the much desired Lord.

The spontaneous movement which brought those Christians taken up with the Absolute to follow the lead of the first anchorites into a place apart made of the latter the bounden guides of their generous enterprise. All of them were not prudent, and all of them did not possess the physical and moral qualities necessary for a monk. And if it is true that one can hear God more easily in silence and solitude, the devil too lies in wait there. Does not the the Gospel relate that « Jesus was led into the desert by the Spirit to be tempted by the devil »? (Matt. 4, 1). It thus befell to the Fathers to direct in the ways of ascent and of prayer souls belonging to very different degrees of the spiritual life. They had to adapt themselves and employ all their will to make each one understand how to govern his soul and make it completely submissive to God; and many among them became masters in the art of discerning spirits, of curing scruples, of dissipating illusions, of enlightening and encouraging their brother novices or the more advanced. There was nothing as yet of the abstract and of the systematic in this formation, but a simple and concrete wisdom, the use of examples, and formulas drawn from experience, aided by the Holy Spirit. The faithful memoirs of the disciple conserved and transmitted these anecdotes and apophthegms which later were to make up tasteful collections, such as the *Hundred Chapters* of Diadochus of Photike, or the *Spiritual Meadow* of John Moschus, and so many others, the substance of which, communicated to the West as early as the sixth century by John Cassian, has become the patrimony of the « treatises of perfection ».

From Individual Direction to Juridical Organization

In spite of the diversity of times and places, a like spirit animated the anchorites of the 3rd and 4th centuries, and to some degree everywhere the same experience gave rise to a natural evo-

lution towards cenobitism. The first Fathrs, in effect, were for their disciples but benevolent guides whose example and whose counsel sustained generosity and enlightened the mind. But individual direction, useful as it was for advancement in the ways of perfection, did not always suffice to guarantee the hermits against errors and illusions in the proper sense. The history of the Fathers of the desert furnish us with numerous instances of this, often picturesque and sometimes dramatic. Men who at first pretended to practice nothing but self-denial and the renouncement of all things sometimes allowed themselves to be led by pride and obstinacy.

The fact is that there was lacking a social framework and that minimum of juridical dependence necessary for the attainment of perfection in any domain whatsoever. The experience of the desert caused the best minds to perceive that the authority of the spiritual Father had to be sanctioned by an agreement, at least a tacit one, and a promise of obedience, permitting him to submit each of his sons to an efficacious control and to provide for the common good — all of which calls for a deeper abnegation, the renunciation of one's own judgment and will, the last refuge of egoism, the last obstacles to the love of God and of one's neighbor. Thus, the « State of perfection » achieved its completion in its essential lines, and it is the Christian East which inaugurated it within the Church.

Universality and Perennial Character of Eastern Spirituality.

Eastern monasticism, in fact, although having preserved specific and precious characteristics, is the source of other forms of Christian monasticism; and its influence, as We have just observed, is to be found to a greater or less degree in all the great religious Orders. That which one can term the spirituality of the desert, that form of contemplative spirit which seeks out God in silence and in deprivation, is a profound movement of the Spirit which will never cease, as long as there will be hearts which will listen to His voice. It is not fear, nor repentance, nor prudence alone which people the solitude of the cloister. It is the love of God. That there should be, in the midst of great modern cities, in the most prosperous countries, as well as in the plains of the Ganges or in the forests of Africa, souls capable of being content to offer a life-long service of adoration and of praise, who consecrate themselves willingly to thanksgiving and to intercession, who freely constitute themselves before the Creator as guarantors for humanity, the protectors and the advocates of their brethren before the Heavenly Father — what a

victory is this for the Almighty, what glory for the Saviour! Indeed, monasticism is essentially this and nothing else.

In view of the foregoing, one can understand why canon law, both of the East and of the West, presents the religious state, and especially that of monks, as worthy of particular honour: « *Status religiosus ... ab omnibus in honore habendus est* » (Cfr. *A. A. S.*, a. 44, 1952, pp. 67-68, can. 2 and 6; *Codex I Can.*, can. 487). It is indeed a great consolation for Us and a motive of fond hope to ascertain that origins and the principal characteristics of monasticism are becoming better known and illustrated from day to day. As We noted in the previously mentioned *Motu Proprio,* the sons of St. Antony, Pachomius, Aphraates, Hilarion, Basil the Great, practiced all the forms of apostolic charity; they cultivated the human knowledge of their times. Almost all the great names of Eastern monasticism distinguished themselves in the defense of the faith. But alas! little by little, that culture and that zeal declined or even disappeared in certain areas. Wise reformers, nevertheless, sustained by the maternal needs of the Church, have in different epochs, even down to our own times, caused the pristine vigour of monasticism to flourish again. We ask of God that your labours and your prayers may contribute to this renewal; and to make manifest to you Our paternal sollicitude and to impetrate this favour for you, We accord to you from the depths of Our heart the Apostolic Benediction.

* * *

Religious Tolerance in Catholic Ireland

On March 17, St. Patrick's Day, the Bureau of Information of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, D. C. issued an interesting release noting the wide religious tolerance in Catholic Ireland. The report was based on a survey made by Rev. John E. Kelly, director of the Information Bureau who recently returned from a visit to the Republic of Ireland. In view of his findings he has asked American Protestant groups and publications which charge that Catholics harrass religious minorities, and cite Spain and Colombia, to give due recognition to the situation in the Irish Republic.

Ireland, with a general population of more than 2.9 million, is 94.5 per cent Catholic. Protestants number 157,500, and Jews account for 3,907 people. The minority groups enjoy complete religious freedom. Hence, Father Kelly concludes, accusations sometimes made that the Catholic Church restricts minorities in any

country where Catholics are in the majority are simply untrue. Other factors, such as national traditions, temperament of the people, and type of government must be considered, the priest declared. Moreover the Catholic Church is as vigorous in Ireland as in other Catholic countries.

Whatever discrimination there is in the 26 counties, stated Fr. Kelly, is actually directed against the Catholic majority. He said that many of the large businesses are owned by wealthy Protestants. As a policy, these firms hire Catholics only for the lesser positions. Executive posts are frequently limited to Protestants. The survey reveals the insurance, distillery, banking, construction, and certain transportation companies as being the most discriminatory.

There is no discrimination by Catholics in the political sphere either, the clergyman observed. He noted that Douglas Hyde, a Protestant, was the first Irish president under the new constitution of 1937. He found this noteworthy in view of challenges that American Catholics are not qualified to hold the highest political offices. Robert Briscoe, a Jew who recently visited the United States, is not only a long-term member of Dublin's city council and a former mayor, but has served in parliament for 32 consecutive years. Furthermore, none of the 10 non-Catholic members of the present Irish parliament were subjected to religious questionings during the 1957 election year. (1).

In his statement Fr. Kelly said that Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston summed up the Catholic view on voting for can-

---

(1) Senator Biggar, a Protestant member of parliament from Trinity College, Dublin, declared in December, 1948: « I want to point out that I and the Protestant minority in this country have never experienced the slightest interference with our freedom to worship God as we please. I do not think a single instance of interference on religious ground with the Protestant minority can be produced in this country, and I will endeavour, and I hope successfully, to make this point clear, not only to this House, but to the whole of Ireland, North and South, that the fear commonly held by people in the North that there would be religious persecution or some religious disability in this country is entirely false and erroneous. There is complete liberty here. The Protestant minority, if there was a united Ireland with a majority of Catholics in power, would be just as well treated as they are in the Six Counties at present, in Great Britain, or in any other part of the world.

The fear of persecution or lack of freedom is entirely unfounded. I will go further than that and say that in worldly affairs the Protestant minority here are not merely well-treated, but they are too well-treated. The various Governments of this country have been so anxious to be fair that they have awarded far more preferment to them than the numerical strength of the Protestant minority would warrant ». (*Official Report, Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. 36, no. 2).

didates in a speech delivered last year at a St. Patrick's dal reception in Boston for Mr. Briscoe. Disagreeing with many people who wondered how a Jew could be elected mayor of Catholic Dublin, the Boston prelate said:

« I can see nothing extraordinary about it. For when since St. Patrick have true Catholics been so un-Catholic as to vote against candidates for public office because they are not Catholics? He who does so, in the act and judgment at least, is truly un-Catholic, untrue to that way of life that forever affirms the essential dignity and brotherhood of all men of whom God is the Father, the beginning and the end ».

As further evidence of religious harmony, Dr. I. Jakobovits, Chief Rabbi of Ireland, told the compiler of the report in an interview in Dublin that Jews suffer neither legal disabilities nor discrimination. In fact, the ranking Jewish leader declared that « the religious environment of the country makes it easier for Jews to practice their religion ». Dr. Jakobovits also has been in the United States on a recent lecture tour.

In Dublin, Archbishop G. O. Sims ,of the (Anglican) Church of Ireland, likewise agreed in an interview with the American clergyman that minorities are free from disabilities in Ireland. The archbishop also said that he strongly favored the advancement of Catholics to top-management levels in Protestant-owned firms.

Father Kelly reported that with Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish schools under their own direction, there is full opportunity for pupils of all faiths to receive the religious instruction that their parents approve. Far from being « divisive », the priest said that such a school system allows people with faith in God to work for the common welfare of the nation. He stated further that Ireland's education system was additional evidence of harmonious living among the different faiths.

The primary national schools in the Irish Republic are made up of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish schools, all of which receive government funds for construction, operating expenses, and teachers' salaries. In rural areas where Protestants are scattered, free bus transportation is provided to nearby Protestant schools. To obtain national recognition, a school must have a minimum of 20 pupils. Nevertheless, many exceptions are made for Protestant rural schools where average attendance is only 10 pupils.

Even though there is a felt need for the construction of additional churches in Ireland, Father Kelly declared that Catholics make no requests for the return of their churches confiscated in the years after the Reformation. The Protestant minority in the country enjoy the use of large cathedrals and churches which were

taken over by the English government. It is ironical, the clergyman said, that one of these now non-Catholic cathedrals, the most impressive in Dublin, is named St. Patrick's.

For the 3,450 Jews living in Dublin there are eight synagogues, served by three rabbis and five lectors. Yet the *Irish-Jewish Year Book* for 1957-58 lists two Jewish schools, 10 charitable organizations, as hospitals, homes for the aged, students' aid, and combined Israel Charities funds; professional organizations for clergy, teachers, and physicians; 13 Zionist groups; B'Nai Brith and three other fraternal societies; seven youth groups; nine general associations, as the Jewish Club, and the Hebrew Speakers' Circle. Provisions for kosher baked goods, and supervised food products are more than ample. A special section of the Dublin slaughter house, in fact, is set apart for the butchering of animals according to the Jewish rite.

* * *

Work for Jewish-Christian understanding at Freiburg-im-Breisgau, and its Ecumenical significance

The Holy Father's discourse at the inauguration of the Holy Year in reply to those who are still sincerely but in vain awaiting constantly the Messiah as though He had not yet come, has made us realise, many for the first time, the ecumenical aspect of Jewish-Christian relations; that is to say, we Catholics are all united with Jews as well as with Protestants *in Christ*, even if, for the Jews, the Christ who came down for us in the person of Jesus, and who will reveal Himself to them at his second coming, is not yet the same as the Messiah whom they await.

Our attention should rightly be drawn, therefore, to events which have been experienced in that country where Christians and Jews were for the first time subjected to persecution together, in that persecution organised by Hitler. At the time when the first post-war *Katholikentag* had been prepared in Germany (which took place in Mainz in 1948) a small group of German Catholics was gathered around Mme. Gertrude Luckner of Freiburg-im-Breisgau, who had been charged by the late Archbishop Groeber with the task of caring for the Jewish victims of persecution. It was through this group that Mme. Luckner made contact with the Jewish services which were defending the interests of their compatriots. Immediately after her own liberation from the concentration camp at Ravensbruck where she herself had finally been imprisoned from

1943 to 1945, she set herself to the task of demanding material and above all moral reparation for the recent crimes, and of helping to transform the mentality which had committed or facilitated them.

In order to clarify the real problems of Christian and Jewish relations on a theological plane Mme. Luckner sought out Mr. Karl Thieme of Basle, now a professor at Mainz University, a Bible commentator and the author of a book on the divergent doctrines which, according to the Epistle of Barnabas and the Dialogue of St. Justin, place the new-born Church in opposition to the Synagogue. (*Kirche und Synagoge,* Olten, 1945). At this time Mr. Karl-Heinz Schmidthüs, editor of *Herderkorrespondenz Orbis Catholicus* and a member of the Central Board of German Catholics, joined the group presided over by Mr. Joerger, editor of *Caritasverband* which published for the first time, on behalf of the *Katholikentag* of Mainz, several hundred duplicated copies of *Rundbrief zur Förderung der Freundschaft zwischen dem Alten und dem Neuen Gottesvolk im Geiste beider Testamente,* known summarily as *Freiburger Rundbrief* from its sixth year of publication.

Now appearing with a circulation of 7,000, with 112 printed pages, the 10th volume of this periodical (which can be obtained through Mme. Luckner, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Werthmannhaus) is again a faithful expression of the aims followed from its beginning. It begins with a discourse « Never Forget » delivered on July 20 1954 by the lawyer Küster, who became famous for his valiant struggle for reparations for Israel and the survivors of the persecutions. This discourse has an extraordinary contemporary interest in its concern to point out the moral danger which threatens the Germans in the midst of the *Deutsche Wirtschaftswunder.*

Following this is an article commemorating the priest-martyr M. Kolbe, which is a brief recollection of « The Image of Christ on the Wall of KZ » (Oswiecim) which had been inscribed there. Next, Karl Thieme deals with « The Religious Aspect of Antisemitism ». The scriptural analysis by which he distinguishes three themes, the « people scattered through all the provinces of the kingdom » (Ester III, 8); the « Decomposition » (Daniel XIV, 27); and the « universal enmity of the Jews against humanity » serves as a starting-point for an examination of the stages of evolution in anti-Semitism — the period before Christ; the period between Constantine and the Holy Roman Emperors; the period after the Crusades; and lastly ,the « Age of Enlightenment ».

Articles follow on the Holy Week liturgy and the new national German Catechism (by Fr. Démann, N. D. S.), on the people of Israel as dealt with in recent German educational books on Scrip-

ture and history, on the historical falsifications in Leon Feuchtwanger's novel *Josephus,* an account of the state of mind in Israel from a religious point of view, and of the separated brethren of the race of Ismail, followed by a review of political events in the Near East.

After this the reader will discover, perhaps not without some surprise, a report taken from *Herderkorrespondenz,* of a week-end spent in community with the *Katholische Bildungswerk Berlin* and *the Evangelische Akademie* in that same city, where the question « Is the Una Sancta movement possible with the Jews? » was discussed. An affirmative answer was given, in accordance with Our Lord's words, « one flock, one shepherd », (St. John X, 16). In the same strain are the reports on the scriptural and ecclesiastical analyses made by organizations affiliated to the World Council of Churches concerning the relations of Christians and Jews. Here, as in the critical bulletins and reviews, is a record of a development which is bound to have repercussions on the Ecumenical Movement; it should, and in time it will win ground in such a way that our brethren separated in Abraham will take their part in it. Jewish reactions, which one finds constantly in the *Rundbrief,* prove abundantly that this tentative effort to break down the walls of separation are not without success as regards mutual understanding. And the Christian who knows his Bible is persuaded that the Lord's words will one day come to pass: — « Because then I will restore to the people a chosen lip, that all may call upon the name of the Lord, and may serve Him with one shoulder (Sophonias III, 9) — in one single common will.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Lambeth Conference Opens at Canterbury

Inaugurated by a sermon delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, the ninth Lambeth Conference formally opened its sessions on July 3. More than 300 Anglican bishops from all over the world, together with representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Armenian Church, the Old Catholic and Lutheran Churches, the Free Churches of Great Britain, and the Church of Scotland were present in Canterbury Cathedral for the opening services.

« This distracted world », declared Dr. Fisher, « needs quite desperately, to discover how and at what price and by what spiritual hazards friendship, harmony, peace among men can be had. To tell the world the answer, to show that answer among all people, by the witness of its own people, is the urgent service demanded of the Church.

« In this Conference we shall give some attention to those factors, cultural, racial and national, which by their strains and stresses put peace to flight and turn men to hurt and devour each other. And we shall consider also those varied modern conditions which are threatening the wholesomeness and indeed the stable existence of the family and of the home: since it is in the home that all philanthropy, all pure and redeeming and holy love begins and ends. We shall seek by God's help to speak such reconciling words as we can find; that people in their families, and peoples in their societies, may give heed to the stern judgments of God and may turn to obey His loving counsels ... ».

« The work of reconciliation », continued the Anglican Primate, « cannot be done by ourselves nor for ourselves alone. It is only in fellowship with Churches of other Communions, and in cooperation with them, and in the humility and generosity which friendship teaches us, that we can learn to tread together the narrow path along which Our Lord is guiding us and them. A spirit which was hardly visible in 1867 is now visibly at work and bearing fruit everywhere in Christendom ... The spirit of reconciliation in Christ is the spirit of the Ecumenical Movement, which William Temple

called ' the great new fact of our times '. It is no longer new; but it does not grow old. It increases and it is God who gives the increase. The whole Catholic Church knows that Christ is calling it to the joys and hazards of a reconciliation and reunion still beyond our reach but no longer beyond our confident endeavour ».

The Anglican bishops will meet for private sessions in Lambeth Palace, London, the seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury until August 10 to consider five main points on the Conference agenda: the authority and message of the Bible, the progress of Anglicanism, international problems such as disarmament and nationalism, the family in modern society, and the unity of the Church. The latter was expected to be the major focal point of discussion.

Earlier Dr. Fisher had told a press conference that differences separating the churches are a « scandal and an impediment ». « It is now accepted », he said, « that Jesus Christ, who is the head of the Church, means it to be one. Whereas 40 years ago nobody but a few wild enthusiasts thought it possible, now every sensible member of every communion knows it is possible ».

Scottish Assembly Defers Action on Unitive Report

The report made public last year, based on discussions with a view to reunion between representatives of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church of England, was sent back to the sixty-six presbyteries of the Scottish Kirk for further study after a vote by the delegates attending the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in late May, The report, entitled *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches,* is the work of a thirty-man committee which employed a period of three years to frame it. Beginning with the conviction that Christ wills a visible unity for His Church, the report in its recommendations steers between the Anglican insistence on the historic episcopate and the Presbyterians' contention regarding the validity of their orders and active lay participation in the running of church affairs.

The actual vote of the General Assembly was preceded by a long and acrimonious debate, influenced to a greater or lesser degree by a recent press campaign decidedly against the report. (The traditional resentment of the Scots against the Anglican episcopacy is generally well known). In the course of the Assembly discussion, Dr. A. C. Craig, of Glasgow, convenor of the Inter-Church Relations Comittee, said that « it would be folly amounting

to vandalism to relegate the document to the scrap heap of frustrated hopes ».

When the vote was taken by the delegates, 357, as against 328, voted to send the report back to the local presbyteries for « official study and comment ». In its instruction to the presbyteries, the Assembly called for specific opinions on the theological terms of the report and the forwarding of possible proposals thought to be more feasible than those actually contained in the document.

The report in question was also expected to come up for consideration by the Lambeth Conference when it discussed current schemes of unity involving the Anglican Church.

Anglican Archbishop of Wales Discusses Motives of Reunion

Speaking at a diocesan conference in June, Dr. Edwin Morris, the Anglican Primate of Wales, discussed the question of the decline of Nonconformity among the Welsh and pointed out that in consequence of this efforts were being made to amalgamate theological colleges and other facilities among differing denominations in order to bring about a « united front ».

Commenting on this expedient, Dr. Morris declared: « We must view with sympathy and understanding this drawing together of Christian communions, but I cannot help expressing my own regret that the present movement towards closer relations amongst the Free Churches in Wales seems to be actuated mainly by economic motives. The proper motive for coming together would be agreement in belief and practice. This agreement in belief should not be at a shallow level, but should comprehend the deep Christian verities. Anything less than this would be to suggest or assume that the deep truths of the Christian creed do not really matter.

« Our forefathers separated from each other because they disagreed about their understanding of the matters revealed by God in Jesus Christ. Their disagreement was, of course, lamentable, but it would be even more lamentable to say that the things about which they disagreed were of no account and should now be disregarded because the separate denominations are becoming too weak to stand alone ».

The Welsh Primate said that any true *rapprochement* among divided Christians required a doctrinal basis and that « we cannot without the gravest breach of trust and dereliction of duty seek any other way of ending our divisions than by ' agreement in the faith ' ». (*Ch. Times*).

Episcopalian Proposals Regarding the Church of South India

The twenty-one member Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, headed by Bishop Angus Dun of Washington, recently made public a series of resolutions concerning future relations with the Church of South India. The latter body was formed by the amalgamation of Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist churches in 1947.

The Commission is hoping that the General Convention of the Episcopal Church will adopt the resolutions, some of which are more stringent than those previously suggested by the Committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church which visited South India and those adopted two years ago by the Convocations of Canterbury and York.

The resolutions in question call for strict limitations in the case where a bishop or episcopally ordained presbyter is invited to celebrate within a diocese or district of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This he will be able to do with the permission of the Episcopalian bishop, provided that he be willing while within the diocese or district to celebrate in Episcopalian churches only, except on occasions acknowledged by the bishop as having important ecumenical significance.

The Commission has asked that if the bishop authorizes the celebration of the South India liturgy in a church within his jurisdiction, it should be for the congregation of that church. It further asks that members of the Church of South India who desire to become habitual communicants or communicant members of the Protestant Episcopal Church should be required to conform with its regular discipline.

If the Commission's recommendations regarding the reception of the sacraments in the C. S. I. are approved, Episcopalians would be required to receive them only at the hands of bishops and episcopally ordained presbyters. (*L. Church*).

American Protestant Councils to Promote Faith and Order

Matters of Faith and Order formed the principal concern of the 200 executives of local, state, national and international church councils who attended the annual meeting of the Association of Council Secretaries, held at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, from June 15-21. Among the most prominent churchmen attending was Dr. Franklin Clark Fry who is president of the United Lutheran

Church in America and chairman of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches.

A daily seminar dealt with aspects of « The Challenge of Faith and Order to American Christianity » and was led by Dr. Nils Ehrenström of Boston University School of Theology, and a former staff member of the Division of Studies of the World Council of Churches.

In an address dealing with the present and future of the ecumenical movement in the United States, Dr. Roy G. Ross, general secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., cited the remarkable growth of state and city councils. He then went on to predict an increase in the tempo of negotiations for church union, an emphasis on the « theological assumptions » underlying council activities, a clearer understanding of the place of councils in church life following a study of the « ecclesiological significance of councils of churches », more local co-operation, and better co-ordination of activities of councils at various levels.

Earlier in June a Faith and Order office was set up by the National Council of Churches in the U. S. A. at the meeting of its General Board in Minneapolis. The director of the new office is expected to be appointed later this year and will endeavor to carry out the recommendations of the study conference on « The Nature of the Unity We Seek » held in Oberlin, Ohio, last September. (*EPS*)

Major Presbyterian Union Effected in the United States

A merger involving two of the largest Presbyterian bodies in America, with a combined membership of over three million, was effected in Pittsburgh on May 28. The union was formed from two previously independent branches: the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A .and the United Presbyterian Church of North America. The new body will now be known as the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The « plan of union » which led to the merger was originally to have included a third branch of Presbyterianism, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Southern), but failed to obtain the necessary approval of the local presbyteries. Nevertheless, hope was expressed at the Pittsburgh conference for the eventual entrance of the Southern body into the new union. (*EPS*)

Noted American Jesuit Discusses Catholic and Protestant Relationships

Speaking at Richmond, Virginia, recently, Fr. Gustave Weigel, S. J. declared that Protestants feel a « willingness to come nearer to Catholicism », but he said that this did not necessarily mean that there would be large-scale conversions. The Jesuit theologian dealt with current « friendly dialogues » between Catholics and Protestants in a speech to the 48th annual convention of the Catholic Press Association. He said that the result of such dialogues is « not immediately religious ». Rather they produce an atmosphere in which members of the two religious communities can « live together in harmony and friendship instead of at war with each other ». Catholic-Protestant dialogues, he added, are an « American obligation ».

In his address, Fr. Weigel listed three important factors in the growth of Protestant-Catholic friendliness: « the numerical increase of Catholics, the weakening hold of Protestant churches on their members, and the loss of Protestant inviolability ».

Until these factors became prominent, he said, « the Protestants and all others for that matter, considered this land to be ... white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant ».

After post-World War I criticism of Protestant churches for supporting the Prohibition law — « perhaps the biggest civic success organized Protestantism achieved » — American Protestants lost their inviolability, Fr. Weigel asserted. They « suddenly discovered they belonged to one of many religions in the country, and they had to take their chances like all the others, » he added. This resulted in efforts toward the revival of Protestantism, which developed into the ecumenical movement. This hope of a united church, in turn, « necessarily makes the Protestant look at Catholicism, and look at it more sympathetically than he did in the past », the speaker maintained.

During a question period after his address, Father Weigel was asked to evaluate the danger of indifferentism — the tendency to regard all religions as equally good — that is involved in Catholic-Protestant dialogues. The speaker considered the danger a real one and warned that « not every Tom, Dick, or Harry can jump into the dialogue. It needs much preparation and proper inoculation against indifferentism ».

« Protestant and Catholic must live by side throughout the forseeable future », concluded the Jesuit theologian. « From every point of view, the religious point included, it is far better that they live together in harmony and friendship instead of at war with each

other ... A climate of suspicion and resentment is not the proper environment for virtue, and it certainly weakens national unity. It is equally good for both Protestant and Catholic that they understand each other thoroughly and that they learn to trust each other in their differences » (*NC*).

Minister Cites Charity as Field for Catholic-Protestant Co-operation

« Co-operation between Catholics and Protestants is possible in at least one field — charity », a Protestant minister told a convention of Catholics recently held at Neufchatel, in Switzerland.

The Reverend J. Javet of the Swiss National Reformed Church made the statement in an address at the meeting, the second of its kind for Catholics of the canton. The clergyman was guest of honor at the convention, at which more than 5000 persons were present. They also heard Bishop François Charriere of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg stress collaboration between all men of good will in worthy projects.

« Everyone will respect you and will respect your faith », declared the Bishop in a sermon delivered during a Mass offered at the end of the convention, « if they know that on account of your faith they can fully rely on your generous co-operation » (*NC*).

Noted Catholic Ecumenist Dies in Belgium

Dom Clement Lialine, a monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Chevetogne who devoted many years of his life to ecumenical questions, died towards the end of April in a clinic at Namur following a serious operation.

Born in St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1901 he eventually emigrated together with many of his countrymen in 1920 and arrived in Belgium the following year. A short time later he joined the Church of Rome, expressing the wish of dedicating himself to the cause of Christian unity. After spending two years as professor at the Benedictine Abbey of Maredsous, Dom Lialine entered the Priory of Amay in 1928 with Dom Lambert Beauduin as his director. Following the completion of his theological studies Dom Clement was ordained a priest and soon after distinguished himself by his remarkable intellectual gifts, his mastery of foreign languages, and his deeply religious spirit — elements that were of great value in the interconfessional contacts that he began to undertake between the two world wars.

In close touch with the ecumenical circles of Geneva, and frequently called upon to deliver conferences at various meetings, he felt it his special task to make known to the western world the religious treasures of the Eastern Church, especially that of his native land for which he had always preserved a deep attachment. Esteemed by many of his former co-religionists as well as by Protestants and Catholics, he contributed a great deal by his correspondence and by his writings to the ideal of Christian unity. It is for this reason that the news of his passing has been regretted in many quarters. (*La Libre Belgique*).

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Cardinal Agagianian Named Pro-Prefect of Congregation for Propagation of the Faith

His Eminence, Gregory Peter XV Cardinal Agagianian has recently been named by Pope Pius XII as Pro-Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to succeed the late Cardinal Samuel Stritch. Cardinal Agagianian, who is Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians, thus assumes one of the most important posts in the government of the Catholic Church — an office which looks after the welfare of over thirty million Catholics throughout the mission territories of the world.

Born on September 18, 1895, in Tsarist Russia — at Akhaltsikhe near the Turkish border of Georgia — the Armenian Patriarch went to Rome early in his youth to begin his studies for the priesthood. He was ordained in 1917 and in 1919 returned as pastor to Tiflis, Georgia, by then a part of the Soviet Union. Called to Rome in 1921, he was made assistant rector of the Armenian Pontifical College where he remained for fourteen years.

In 1935 Cardinal Agagianian was consecrated a bishop and took up residence in Syria. Two years later he was elected patriarch by the synod of the Armenian Rite hierarchy in Beirut, and his election was confirmed by the Holy See a short time later. He was named a Cardinal by the present Pope in 1946.

Cardinal Agagianian is master of twelve languages, including a fluent command of English. He is likewise a versatile scholar and a churchman of broad and unusual experience. Widely traveled, he has paid several visits to North and South America and Australia. In addition, the Cardinal has shown a particular interest in matters of reunion. Besides keeping in touch with the activities of the Unitas Association, he has frequently participated in Catholic functions relating to Christian unity.

Monument to Great Greek Cardinal Unveiled in Rome

A monument to Cardinal Johannes Bessarion, assiduous worker for the reunion of Latin and Eastern Churches, was unveiled recently in Rome in the presence of two cardinals.

The ceremony of unveiling took place in the splendid Church of the Twelve Apostles, once the titular church of the 15th century prelate. It was attended by the Dean of the Sacred College of Cardinals, His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, and by the Patriarch of Antioch of the Syrians, Ignace Gabriel Cardinal Tappouni, as well as by clergy and laity of both the Latin and Eastern Rites. Byzantine music was provided by the choir of the Pontifical Greek College.

Cardinal Bessarion (1402-1482) was a leading figure at the Concil of Florence in the successful effort for reunion of the separated Greek Church with Rome. Although the union was short-lived, the great cardinal dedicated the rest of his life in a sustained effort to bring about the reunion of the Eastern Churches with the Holy See. (*NC*)

Oriental Institute Sponsors Congress on Eastern Monasticism

The Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies in Rome was host in Easter Week to a group of experts in Eastern Christianity who met to discuss the general theme of « Eastern Monasticism ».

The program was opened by two papers dealing with general aspects of the theme. The first of these was entitled « Spiritualité monacale et unité chrétienne » and was read by Fr. Irénée Hausherr, S. J. of the Oriental Institute. The second was read by Dom Olivier Rousseau, O. S. B. of Chevetogne who took as his subject « Le role important du monachisme dans l'Eglise d'Orient ».

There followed next two lectures on general questions of a juridical nature by faculty members of the Oriental Institute, and on the successive days of the congress scholars from various countries spoke on aspects of Slavic, Byzantine, Syrian, Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopian monasticism.

New Abbess General of Brigittine Order Elected

At the General Chapter of the Brigittine Order of Our Most Holy Saviour which took place in Rome at Pentecost, Mother Richard Beauchamp-Hambrough was elected Abbess General to succeed

Mother Maria Elizabeth Hesselblad who died last year. A native of England, the new Abbess General of the Brigittine Sisters had served many years as assistant general of the Order, whose Sisters now have convents in Sweden, Switzerland, England, Italy, the United States, and India.

In the spirit of her Order which is dedicated to the cause of Christian unity, especially with regard to the people of Scandinavia, Mother Richard has done much over the years to further the aims of the Unitas Association whose center is situated at the Brigittine Mother House at Piazza Farnese in Rome. The members of the Association, accordingly, extend to the new Superior General their best wishes and their prayers for a long a fruitful apostolate in her chosen work.

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Noted Catholic Historian Invited to New Chair at Harvard

The noted British historian, Mr. Christopher Dawson, has been invited to occupy a newly established Chair at Harvard's Divinity School. Known as the Charles Chauncey Stillman Chair, it is designed « to attract to the university distinguished scholars and teachers who can give a wider understanding of the Catholic Church to students in the Divinity School ».

Announcing the appointment of Mr. Dawson, Harvard's President Dr. Nathan M. Pusey said: « The Stillman guest professorship ... will illuminate for future ministers of the Protestant denominations the history, theology, and dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, and its implications for the modern mind ... In Professor Dawson we have found one whose broad learning and far-reaching sense of the cultural effects of religion in human life make him a respected and admired interpreter of the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Dawson is the first in what promises to be a notable line of guest professors ».

At the time of this writing, Mr. Dawson had failed to qualify for an American visa on medical grounds, but because British physicians have disagreed with the diagnosis it is still hoped that he may eventually be granted the necessary visa. (*The Tablet*).

* * *

ITALY

Church's Defense of Dogma Does not Involve Intolerance Declares Cardinal

The Church must always be intolerant when it comes to the defense of dogma, but this does not in any way entail civil or practical intolerance. Such was the view expressed by His Eminence Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna during a study week in his see city on relations between Church and State organized by the Bologna Center of Dominican Theological Studies.

Nothing that the principle of the greater good is involved in any discussion of religious tolerance, the Cardinal asked: « What is a greater good which justifies or demands Catholic tolerance concerning other religious groups? » He answered the question by saying that « the virtue which generally justifies tolerance is caution, considered in our case in relation to the respect of truth and of the human world's ability to accept this truth ».

Cardinal Lercaro declared that in the Catholic Church a distinction had to be made between dogmatic and civil intolerance. « The Church », he said, « cannot renounce the first because by failing to profess it, she would automatically place herself under the concept of historic truth » (rather than revealed truth).

« Dogmatic intolerance is, therefore, necessarily linked up with the concept of eternal truth, but this does not in any way entail civil or practical intolerance », concluded the Cardinal. « The greater good which allows civil tolerance is the respect for truth called for by the freedom of consent. An imposed truth is something which is not acceptable as such. When it is imposed, we have the confusion of religion and politics, the typical truth of every form of paganism (which is) today carried to the extreme in totalitarian regimes ». (*NC*).

* * *

GERMANY

Lutheran Leader Declares Protestants and Catholics Stand United in East Germany

East Germany's Protestants « stand in a united front » with Catholics against the regime's atheistic Marxism, the Presiding Bishop of the Germany Evangelical Church has declared. Preaching in Karlshorst in mid-June, Bishop Otto Dibelius, Lutheran Bishop

of Berlin and one of the six presidents of the World Council of Churches, severely took to task the anti-religious campaign in the Soviet zone of Germany. He urged his fellow Protestants in both the eastern and western sectors of Berlin to show Christian solidarity in the face of atheistic materialism by making accommodations available to Catholics who were to come there for their national meeting in August. He asked specifically that Protestants receive Catholics as welcome guests in their homes during the *Katholikentag,* or Catholic Congress scheduled for August 13 to 17. « Though we may differ in doctrine », the Bishop declared, « all Catholics should know that we serve one and the same Lord ».

Bishop Dibelius's appeal for a common Christian front against the onslaught of atheism is no new development. In January 1956, he became the first head of the Lutheran Church in Germany to pay a call on the Pope. He was received in audience by His Holiness Pope Pius XII while en route to a meeting of the World Council of Churches in Australia. A member of his staff said later that the Protestant leader's request for an audience was prompted by his desire to demonstrate that Protestants and Catholics are determined to stand together when it is a question of defending Christian values.

Shortly before his Karlshorst sermon, Bishop Dibelius told the all-German Synod of the Lutheran Church that all religion is the target of the communists — « not only Protestantism, but Catholicism and Judaism in its traditional form ». Referring to the rituals sponsored by the Communist government to take the place of Baptism and Confirmation, he called on all who believe in God to resist. « In this resistance, all men who acknowledge the fatherhood of God can legitimately join hands, regardless of fundamental doctrinal differences », he said.

Following the Synod, Bishop Dibelius paid a brief call on Catholic Bishop Julius Doepfner of Berlin. Although he declined to reveal what was discussed during the visit, he indicated that he had expressed his appreciation for Bishop Doepfner's stand against communism and his co-operation in the work of trying to preserve freedom of worship.

Meanwhile, the Protestant Synod of Saxony, meeting at Halle, unanimously reaffirmed its stand that Christian Confirmation and the communist « youth dedication » rites are irreconcilable. The Synod declared in a formal statement that young people who yield to pressure and go through these pagan ceremonies cannot be admitted to Holy Communion unless they recant, and then only after a one-year probation. (*NC*)

* * *

HUNGARY

Lutheran Bishop again Deposed by Government Authorities

The Hungarian Lutheran newspaper *Evangelikus Elet* recently published the announcement that Bishop Lajos Ordass has once more been removed from his position as head of the Southern Diocese of the Hungarian Lutheran Church. The alleged reason for the deposition was the churchman's intransigent attitude assumed towards the government's Department of Church Affairs.

Condemned to prison during the same period in which Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested, Bishop Ordass had reassumed the direction of the Lutheran Church in Hungary during the insurrection of October, 1956. The Kadar government had subsequently accorded him a certain liberty of action, and in fact he had been permitted to go to the United States for the congress organized by the Lutheran World Federation. However, little by little he began to fall out of favor with the State authorities. Thus, on June 24 at a meeting of the Lutheran Council of the Southern Diocese, in the presence of the government minister, Janos Horvath, the decision to remove him from his post was taken. He is now constrained to live in retirement.

Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, president of the Lutheran World Federation, has stated that the removal of Bishop Ordass was the logical consequence of series of events influenced by pressure from the government. In deploring the decision taken in his regard, a declaration of the L. W. F. read in part, « the esteem in which this stalwart and truly Christian figure is held all over the world is undiminished; indeed our admiration for the constancy of his spirit grows and grows ». (*La Croix*)

BOOK REVIEWS

THE BRIDGE. *A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies,* vol. II. Edited by John M. Oesterreicher. New York, Pantheon Books, 1957, pp. 357.

This second volume in the projected series of Judaeo-Christian studies will undoubtedly be welcomed by the public with the interest and sympathy accorded the first volume of 1956. Thanks to the efforts of its enterprising editor, the Rev. John M. Oesterreicher, its pages make up an achievement that we are sure will meet with the appreciation of all those who are interested in what is the actual attitude of Christianity with reference to the many questions dealing with the Semitism of our day.

The present work follows the same arrangement of the first volume of the series and is accordingly divided into four sections, each of which is given over to studies, perspectives, surveys, and book reviews. The preface by the editor expresses a word of thanks for the reception given to the first volume and explains that *The Bridge* aspires to be a genuine dialogue of the Church with Israel, with the basis being the Christian faith and an unlimited love for all the « separated brethren in Christ »: « Whether the ' other ' is met not as an object but as a ' thou ', a living and loved being, there is dialogue. Again, to serve a dialogue is something deeper and more fruitful than to enter into a discussion » (p. 10).

The section devoted to *Studies* begins with a biblico- theological meditation on the theme « The Word is a seed » written by Alexander Jones, who brings into relief the main lines of thought which, beginning with the Old Testament concept of *dabar,* or ' word ', lead to the Joannine Logos incarnate (pp. 13-34). A precise and penetrating study by Charles Journet follows on the « Mysterious Destinies of Israel » in which the author brings to the fore the Messianic testimonies of the Old Testament and shows how they find their fulfillment in Jesus Christ whom Tertullian so aptly called *Illuminator antiquitatum.* The hope of the Jews was under the continuous temptation to take these promises of the coming Messias and of His kingdom in a sense that was too

literal, too earthly and almost materialistically. The Christian Church, which is the fulfillment of those promises, realizes them all instead on the moral and spiritual plane. And it is precisely the eminent holiness of the nascent Judaeo-Christian Church which constitutes the profound link between the people of God of the Old Covenant and that of the New ... « Never again, I think, will the Church on earth be so fervent, so loving, so pure, as when she was Jewish; never again in the course of the ages will she find sanctity like that of Mary or even like that of the apostles. One of the reasons for this, her initial excellence, was the task entrusted to her as she came forth from the hands of the Messiah » (p. 58).

Msgr. Journet proceeds next to delve into the intricate and difficult questions of the culpability of the Jewish people in the past and of its reintegration in the future. Here he makes the point that individually many Jews, initially and spiritually, already belong to the Church: « And without doubt, there are many who thus belong, in an incipient and salutary way, to the Church universal » (p. 68).

An entirely new and most recent aspect — and one which is at the same time of the highest importance — of the relations between the Church and Israel is amply and masterfully dealt with by Fr. Oesterreicher in an article entitled ' The Community of Qumran ' (pp. 91-134). He justly regards the monks of the Desert of Juda as a real link which conjoins both the one and the other and which « ... are a fresh witness to the oneness of the Judaeo-Christian tradition: no abrupt departure but a fulfillment leads from the Israel of old to the Church » (p. 97). The article distinguishes itself for its abundant documentation, its lucid exposition, and its cogent evaluation of the elements involved. In the course of his essay, the author effectively challenges the position taken with such an exaggerated enthusiasm by Dupon-Sommer with reference to the Qumran community, a view that would make the Teacher of Justice a real and proper precursor of Jesus — in fact, one who was even greater and more original than Christ Himself. Fr. Oesterreicher, however, approaches the question with genuine prudence and carefully considers all the parallel and divergent lines, even to the minutest details. Thus, for example, he notes on page 197 that the term ' Essenes' is not simply a synonym for the ' Qumranites ' but is rather a generic name embracing a variety of related groups. With regard to the Church and its constitution, he derives from the recently discovered documents the just conclusion that the ' overseer ' of the Qumranites could have served as a distant example of the Christian ' episcopos ',

while in general it is clear that « the men of Qumran were convinced that without order there could be no true union, no lasting fellowship » (p. 108). He is careful to point out, moreover, that « where an untrained eye might see a dependence of the New Testament on the Qumran writings, there is very often simply a dependence of both on the Old Testament or on the apocryphal literature ... » (pp. 126-127). A succinct judgment of the author concludes this excellent essay: « The Teacher of Justice and Christ are incommensurable; Qumran is not the cradle of the Church. Still, for all their shortcomings, the monks of Qumran, poor, chaste, and obedient, penitents of Israel, warriors against the forces of darkness, watchers for God's kingdom, are the Christian's kin » (p. 134).

It is possible here to mention but briefly the main themes of the other contributions to this volume of *The Bridge*. There is an analysis made by Barry Ulanov of the superhuman figures of the five Sibyls and of the seven prophets of Michelangelo in the Sistine Chapel, accompanied by four clear reproductions. This is followed by a sympathetic re-examination of the painful and thorny « affaire Dreyfus », which is not only one of the most notorious cases of modern antisemitism, but still more a « mirror of a century of French history » with its deep crevasses in the modern society of the nation and in its political life. The characteristic differences between the biblico-Semitic and ancient Greek mentalities and that of our modern Western civilization are next brought into relief by Quentin Lauer, S. J. The liturgical and dogmatical sense of the ' perfidiousness ' of the Jews, that is, Jewish unbelief, forms the object of a searching inquiry by Sr. Kathryn Sullivan. Mary Ruth Bede in turn, brings out the resemblance between Christian and Jewish piety as found in the hundred « Benedicite » which every pious Jew recites daily. Richard J. Schoeck makes an interesting contribution on the ideas of the poet Chaucer regarding the Jewish question of his time. And finally, special mention must be made of the detailed exposition of Edward H. Flannery with reference to the part played by Israel in the sphere of Christian hope, the theme which was discussed, somewhat disappointingly, at the World Assembly at Evanston.

The content of this second volume of *The Bridge* is so varied and profound that one cannot help but express the sincere wish of seeing this splendid and useful initiative carried on with all success.

JOHN VODOPIVEC

Documents on Christian Unity. Fourth Series 1948-57. Edited by G. K. A. Bell. Oxford University Press 1958. xviii + 243 pages. Price in U. K., cloth 21/— net; paper 10/6.

Anyone who has had occasion to study the Church relations of these last few decades will have been grateful many a time to Bishop Bell. With this volume his series of *Documents on Christian Unity* had grown to four, covering the years from 1920 onwards, which means that the outstanding pronouncements about Christian unity of nearly forty years are at the student's easy disposal. The centre of reference, as it were, is, of course, the Anglican Communion, but, taken in a large sense, that allows the inclusion of all important ecumenical decisions.

Papal documents, therefore, on Church relations have their place here, and indeed an honourable place, being set immediately after the extracts from the Lambeth Conference. The Eastern Orthodox Churches have to some degree defined their attitude towards Anglicans and the World Council of Churches in decisions that merited mention. The Church of England's conversations with the English Free Churches and with the Church of Scotland, topics very much alive at the moment, its relations with the Scandinavian Churches and the Church of South India, obviously occupy a large section of the volume. Other members of the Anglican Communion, too, are in various stages of negotiation with local ecclesiastical bodies — in the U. S. A., Canada, Nigeria, Ceylon, North India, and Pakistan. Their reports and decisions are noted. The World Council of Churches clearly could not be overlooked, not only because Anglicans are so interested and active in it, but because it is tending to set standards of ecclesiastical relations and is fostering local unions of Churches. But the latest manifestation of its ecumenicity, its desire to amalgamate with the International Missionary Council, may well result in its own undoing, because instead of being able to stand aloof from the vagaries of its members to lead them towards unity, it may now find itself tied to the activities of some of them, and those generally the more sectarian and, therefore, divisive.

From the above outline it can be seen how wide is the scope of Bishop Bell's selection of documents. It gives a bird's-eye view of all statements and movements of Church union, no matter what their source. One is, perhaps, a little surprised to find here the Apostolic Constitution that determines for Catholics the essential form of the diaconate, priesthood and episcopate, but second thoughts approve the choice; more surprised to read among these

documents a pastoral letter of the Archdiocese of Milan. On the other hand, it is not easy to think of any document of importance that has been omitted. It would have been interesting to have been given the more important parts and the conclusion of the report of the committee that visited the Church of South India on behalf of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America; but perhaps that has not yet been officially approved.

A general impression that emerges from a study of this volume is wonder at the degree of activity displayed in union endeavours and the almost ubiquity of its manifestation. That the World Council of Churches takes in the world's Churches goes without saying. But besides that, there are, in most areas of the world, schemes of local union afoot. And in most of these the Anglican Communion is concerned, strengthening its relations with both episcopal and non-episcopal Churches, with the Reformed and the Orthodox. If the results of all these endeavours is to deepen the content of religion, as well as to broaden its front, it is all to the good.

J. Gill, S. J.

Ho Papismòs kaì hi Ounía, Athens, 1958.

After the recent death of Msgr. Calavassy a group of theologians of the Church of Greece assumed the task of offering advice to the Holy See. Having failed to transmit their letter through an official channel of their own government or the diplomatic channel of another power, perforce they sent it through the ordinary post. But, before it could arrive at its destination and be considered, the letter was published in the Athenian press, so that what before had been advice, albeit unsolicited, now took on the aspect of a challenge. In Rome, while one of the Vatican departments had the letter translated and studied at different levels, another department considered what to do for the Greek Catholics of Oriental Rite. Both departments, quite by chance, took action at about the same time, the one to write acknowledging receipt of the letter, the other to appoint a successor to Msgr. Calavassy.

Now in Greece there is a kind of hysteria, at least of a small (perhaps very small) group, that is, however, trying to spread it to others. One of its symptoms is a pamphlet entitled *Papism and the Ounía,* which is being distributed gratis to all and sundry. The writer's name is not specified, which is not surprising. The style however seems to suggest the same source that produced the letter

to the Pope. Neither is the name of the printer indicated; and that is surprising, for most countries insist on knowing who is responsible to the law in the event of possible, later, legal action.

The first half of the pamphlet treats of the papacy. The usual theological arguments of the Orientals against Catholics are briefly, and soberly, put forward — the question of the Holy Spirit; the primacy and the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. Then the writer mentions indulgences, which he has only half understood; the 'penance' imposed in the sacrament of Confession, which distresses him; next, having just asked what happens in the next world to the soul of the death-bed repentant, he rejects Purgatory. Our Lady (so he says) was not conceived immaculate (despite the tradition of the Byzantine liturgy and the homage of the Syrian Ephraem); the Roman clergy puts itself above God, has fatally changed Christ's ordinance in Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion and Extreme Unction, and performs all the sacraments on a principle of magic. The Pope is a tyrant; the cardinals, an excrescence. So far what might be called, roughly, theological objections. Then the ecclesiastical historian seems to assert himself, for there follows a catalogue of defects reminiscent of Photius and Caerularius — the old trivialities produced to impress the ignorant of a bygone age — fasting on Saturday, with alleluias (though the Greek Church chants 'alleluia' all during Lent); the sign of the Cross with four fingers and from left to right; Latin clergy (like St. Paul and Oriental bishops) remaining unmarried; etc. etc. One expected the lament, usual in this context, of the Latin clergy shaving their beards and trimming their hair; but the writer restrained himself.

The second part is entitled *Ounía.* The Church historian shows himself again, for the 'uniate' idea is traced from the year 1215 onwards. But why only from 1215? The idea was at work long before that, as soon, in fact, as there were two liturgical practices in the Church. Quite possibly when St. Athanasius appealed to Rome (the Elder Rome, of course) and went there in 340, there was a practical example of it. The principle of it was consecrated at the Council of Florence (barely mentioned in the pamphlet), when the Western and the Eastern Churches were united on the basis of 'one faith with equality of rite'. That has been the guiding principle of all the unions effected since. The author, perhaps, does not credit this, for he has a section entitled: *Self-contradictions of the Papalists and the Uniates,* in which he asks a whole series of rhetorical questions purporting to prove that the 'Uniates' pretend not to share the whole Catholic faith when in reality they do. Of course they do, and they make no secret of it. All the

theological points that with more or less accuracy the author has outlined in his first part as Catholic errors, those the Pope and the 'Uniates' believe in common, and they do not disguise it. The rest of the pamphlet, enlivened also by an entirely apocryphal account of how the Roumanian Catholic Church of Oriental Rite was liquidated by the Communist government of that country, consists mainly of quotations from the late Archbishop Chrysostomos, whose theme is that 'Ounia' is nothing else than a snare and a delusion and a trap for the unwary.

The Catholic Church of Oriental Rite — the *Hellenórythmi* — came into Greece with the dislocation of populations consequent on the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923. To judge from the tone of this pamphlet one would imagine that the inroads it has made in the course of the last 35 years into the National Church must have been devastating and that it must constitute a threat of the first magnitude to the very existence of that Church.

Just a little common sense to cool the over-heated imagination. In the course of this century the number of Catholics in Greece has gone down by more than half. Professor Konidaris himself, in a truculent article in *Orthodoxos Skepsis* (15 May 1958), warns the Pope that out of a population of seven and half million Greeks there are only 30,000 Catholics. He does not say that of these only about 1000 are of Greek Rite. It is hard, then, to see why people let themselves get so worked up, and difficult to believe that any great section of the thinking public of Greece shares in the excitement.

Our separated brethren of Greece, who in the spirit of the letter of the theological professors want union with Rome, could well show their good will by treating this pamphlet as at once an obstacle to their own aspirations and a reproach to their Church.

J. Gill, S. J.

THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

is an international organization whose purpose it is to promote the spiritual union of men and especially of Christians. It was founded in Rome in 1945 *by a group of professors and writers, priests and laymen; and in June of that year received the blessing of Pope Pius XII. Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, was elected president of the Association and also serves as editor of its organ* Unitas *which appears in three editions: English, French, and Italian.*

Established at the center of Catholicity, the Unitas Association in carrying on its activities endeavours to follow with studied perfection the guidance of the Holy See. In striving to fulfill its purpose, it attempts to regulate its mission in accordance with the following principles:

To Catholics it recalls the benefits of the unity which they enjoy and the duty which is incumbent upon them to pray for those who are deprived of it. The Association invites the active co-operation of Catholics and exhorts them to keep ever before them the advice of Pope Pius XI: « This unity ought to be promoted less by discussion or other means than by the example of a saintly life ».

To its separated brethren of the Eastern Churches, it speaks of those long glorious centuries of union when the Doctors of the East illumined the universal Church and triumphed with their Latin brethren over the most subtle and distressing heresies. Unitas lays stress upon all that the separated East has preserved in common with Catholics: the priesthood, the Sacraments, the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It makes clear the duty of union and strives to eliminate the barriers which prejudice and resentment have in the course of the centuries erected between Christians of the East and West.

To Anglicans and Protestants, Unitas reveals the genuine character of the Roman Catholic Church. Across the imperfections of men, it tries to make evident that spirit of fraternal affection and faithfulness to the teachings of Christ which is at the very heart of the Church's life and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at work in her. Finally, Unitas keeps in close touch with the Ecumenical Movement, and endeavours to aid it in its quest for unity.

* * *

The Unitas Association has affiliated groups in Italy, France, Belgium, Canada, and Turkey. All that is necessary to form a group of this kind to further the aim of Christian unity is that a small number of persons of good will plan their organization, obtain the approval of their bishop, and then make their step known to the Central Committee of the Association in Rome.